

CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

MONDAY, May 4, 1998

Washington Times

May 4, 1998

Pg. 1

Russia raises stakes against NATO

Tensions increase as Moscow balks at alliance's growth

By Martin Sieff
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Even as Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic celebrate last week's Senate ratification of NATO expansion, a new fault line of ethnic tension and superpower stress is emerging in Central Europe.

From the Baltic states to the Balkans, Russia and its allies are confronting new and prospective NATO members in a series of small but ugly crises. The stresses involve Latvia, Poland and the predominantly Albanian province of Kosovo in Serbia.

"The Russian government is following a general approach of seeking to find areas where it can define itself in opposition to perceived interests of the United States and where it can find other countries that share its concern," said Helmut Sonnenfeldt of the Brookings Institution, former chief State Department analyst on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

The Russian government and parliament reacted with fury in March when the commander of the Latvian army appeared at a rally

of former Waffen SS members who had fought with Nazi Germany against Russia in World War II.

"Guided by the ideas of extreme nationalism and Russophobia, this [Latvian] regime has gotten to the point of justifying fascism and those who have committed military crimes and crimes against humanity," the State Duma, the main house of the Russian parliament, said in a strongly worded statement.

Russian politicians have seized on the ethnic rights of the 45,000-strong Russian minority in Latvia — which was forcibly included in the Soviet Union for nearly half a century — making it difficult for President Boris Yeltsin's government to back down from any confrontation.

Moscow Mayor Yuri Luzhkov, widely seen as the front-runner to succeed or challenge Mr. Yeltsin in the 2000 presidential elections, recently joined the chorus of fierce Russian criticism against Latvia.

But the dispute has global implications. Latvia was a part of the Soviet Union until 1990 and lies astride the historic invasion route

toward St. Petersburg that was followed by Napoleon and Hitler.

With this history, Russian policy-makers are alarmed that Latvia may be included in the second wave of NATO expansion, which could start as early as next year.

Poland, meanwhile, is experiencing growing tensions with the former Soviet republic of Belarus to its east. Belarus, under the authoritarian government of President Alexander Lukashenko, has expelled Polish priests claiming they were carrying out subversive activities.

The already strained relations between Warsaw and Minsk took a turn for the worse earlier this year.

The Belarus government was outraged when Poland hosted a Feb. 1 meeting of Belarus opposition leaders in the Polish city of Bialystok.

Belorussian Foreign Minister Ivan Antanovich responded Feb. 5 by accusing Poland of interfering in his country's internal affairs with "a clearly unfriendly act." He claimed the Polish government was plotting to destabilize Belarus

U.S. firms make China more dangerous

Technology aid helps missiles reach America

Washington Times...See Pg. 4

GAO: International Scudbuster Among Costliest Programs

Defense Week...See Pg. 5

Gore Tour Spurs Hopes Of Arabs

Talks With Albright Gain Significance

Washington Post...See Pg. 6



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



and threatened retaliation.

"Each unfriendly act committed by Poland as regards Belarus will receive an adequate response from us," Mr. Antanovich said.

As with Latvia, the dispute could prove to be far more than an obscure regional upset. Poland was one of three countries whose admission to NATO was ratified by the Senate on Thursday, meaning the United States will be obliged to defend it if it is attacked.

Russia, meanwhile, is committed by a year-old union agreement to defend Belarus, which was part of Russia from the 17th century until independence in 1992.

"Belarus is Russia's last remaining security ally in Eastern Europe," said Ted Galen Carpenter, vice president for defense and foreign policy studies at the Cato Institute. "A NATO military presence along the Polish Belorussian border ... risks a collision with a nuclear-armed Russia."

Tensions also are growing between Russia and the United States in the violence-wracked Balkans.

In March, Yugoslavia's Russian-backed president, Slobodan Milosevic, launched a crackdown on ethnic Albanian dissidents in the Albanian-majority province of Kosovo. At least 80 people were killed by Serbian military and police forces.

Since then, there have been persistent skirmishes between Kosovan guerrillas and Serbian forces. Western diplomats have been ineffective in trying to force Mr. Milosevic to negotiate with the rebels, and there are fears of an all-out war.

If that happens, diplomats fear the conflict could spread to mainly Muslim Albania and multiracial Macedonia.

In such a confrontation, Russia could start by supporting Serbia and find itself swept along by the dynamics of the situation, said Paul Goble, deputy director of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and former chief State Department analyst on Soviet nationalities. He spoke in a private capacity.

"The Russians have played the Serbian card on several occasions" by approving aggressive Serbian actions in the former Yugoslavia, Mr. Goble said.

But "Moscow has often found it far easier to turn the Serbs on than to turn them off. Sometimes, they have become the prisoners of their own client, Milosevic."

Some Central European diplomats and intelligence analysts believe Moscow has encouraged new tensions in the region in hopes of frightening the West into slowing or halting the expansion of NATO.

"There is certainly cause for concern. No conclusion has been reached, but governments in the area are certainly considering the possibility" that Russia may have hoped to influence last week's Senate vote, said one senior Central European diplomat.

Mr. Goble added: "It isn't surprising that the enhanced Russian pressure on Latvia should come when the Senate is thinking of a vote on NATO expansion."

He said Moscow had not created the conflicts in the region but was prepared to take advantage of them. "There were things that happened that they have certainly exploited."

Critics of NATO expansion argue that the tensions were caused or exacerbated by the decision to expand the alliance to three new countries.

"The decision to invite Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic to join NATO creates the prospect of far-reaching, dangerous security obligations for the United States in Eastern Europe," Mr. Carpenter said.

The growing tensions between Belarus and Poland in particular raise the possibility of a nuclear confrontation between Moscow and Washington reminiscent of the most dangerous days of the Cold War, Mr. Carpenter said.

Some experts say an insecure Russia, reduced by the collapse of the Soviet Union to its most limited boundaries in 350 years, feels it must assert itself against any further erosion of its power and influ-

ence.

"The Russians are now seeking to express their identity by defining themselves against the United States and by posturing, or taking stands, against what they see as aggressive and insensitive U.S. policies in [Russia's] traditional spheres of influence," Mr. Sonnenfeldt said.

Susan Eisenhower, head of the Center for Political and Strategic Studies, wrote in a recent article that NATO enlargement "appears to the Russians to be motivated by a Western desire to exploit Russia's weakness under the guise of lofty intentions."

Analysts and diplomats say the Clinton administration risks stumbling into new misunderstandings and tensions with Russia by oversimplifying the human rights dimension of some disputes.

Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright said March 9 that the United States did not look upon the Kosovo conflict as an internal issue for Serbia or its parent body, Yugoslavia, but as a human rights issue, which justified intervention by international bodies.

"We must first acknowledge that this crisis is not an internal affair of [Yugoslavia]. The violence is an affront to universal standards of human rights we are pledged to uphold," she said in a statement from London.

But Moscow will likely interpret that kind of approach as an attempt to establish a precedent for the United States to intervene directly in other countries' internal affairs, Mr. Sonnenfeldt said.

"The bold posturing stands that Moscow sometimes takes on international issues is often mixed with a vulnerability they feel about the world community getting involved in the internal affairs of their remaining allies, or in the internal affairs of Russia itself," he said.

The Kosovo conflict in particular "is a tough issue [Russian policy-makers] are concerned with, but it is one that they have shown they are determined to use offensively," he said.

Washington Post

May 4, 1998

Pg. 16

After NATO Vote, Doubts on U.S.-Russia Rapport

Key Relationship Strained by Other Differences as Clinton Has Focused Elsewhere

By John F. Harris
Washington Post
Staff Writer

Once every few weeks, letters -- from formal documents to the occasional handwritten

note -- fly across the Atlantic between the White House and the Kremlin. Less frequently, about every six weeks, an issue will prompt President Clinton or Russian President Boris Yeltsin to phone the other.

As administration officials tell it, this brand of personal diplomacy, resting on the ability of two leaders to understand each other's problems and needs, has become pivotal to the U.S.-Russia relationship. It

is one reason, in the White House view, that Clinton's decision to push an expansion of the NATO alliance never provoked the aggressively hostile reaction in Moscow that many

Russia experts predicted.

But if there really is a special Clinton-Yeltsin rapport -- a bond that pays dividends in the larger relationship between the two nations -- the administration over the next several months will be under particular pressure to prove it anew.

For even as Clinton celebrates a political triumph -- the Senate's overwhelming vote last Thursday to amend the NATO agreement to admit three former Warsaw Pact nations into the alliance that won the Cold War -- the administration is facing criticism that it has allowed its relationship with Russia to fall into a season of drift.

Clinton, the argument goes, has devoted his time to such things as expanding NATO, traveling in Africa and courting China in anticipation of his trip there next month, but has let Russia slip from the central place it deserves in U.S. foreign policy.

There is one country in the world that has some 10,000 nuclear weapons that still could be turned against the West, said Michael McFaul, a Stanford University political scientist who travels frequently to Russia and knows many of the administration's Russia experts. "It's still the most important relationship we have, but you would not know that from Clinton's agenda . . . or how he is spending his time."

For all their supposed rapport, Clinton and Yeltsin have not held a full-scale summit in more than a year, and Clinton has not visited Russia in more than two years.

Clinton and Yeltsin several years ago had pledged to hold annual summits. Aides say Clinton intends to go to Moscow sometime this year, but he has held off scheduling a trip until the Russian lower house of parliament, the State Duma, ratifies the START II nuclear weapons treaty. After a delay of several years, prospects for

Russian passage of that treaty remain as murky as ever. Some Russia experts believe START II passage is even less likely after the NATO vote and after Yeltsin had to expend vast political capital in parliament to install a new prime minister, 35-year-old Sergei Kiriyenko.

With a summit stalled, a host of irritants have dominated discussions between Washington and Moscow and have been the focus of the letters and phone calls between Clinton and Yeltsin, U.S. officials said.

Last winter, while Clinton was pressing for continued sanctions and the option of a military strike against Iraq for blocking U.N. weapons inspectors, Yeltsin warned that a U.S. strike could start a world war and appealed for an early end to sanctions. More recently, Russia has opposed the U.S. position in favor of enhanced sanctions against Yugoslavia as punishment for its recent bloody crackdown against ethnic Albanians in the Kosovo province.

In addition, U.S. officials have been alarmed by continued intelligence indicating Russian transfers of missile technology to Iran, despite assurances by Yeltsin that he wants to halt such activity.

Clinton administration officials said these recent episodes reflect long-standing divergences between U.S. and Russian interests and are not evidence of a Russian backlash against NATO expansion or a sign that Washington's relations with Moscow are suddenly deteriorating. Rejecting charges of high-level inattention, White House officials say Clinton talks with Yeltsin more than any foreign leader except British Prime Minister Tony Blair, and that Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright talks more frequently with Russian Foreign Minister Yevgeny Primakov than with any other of her counterparts.

White House national se-

curity adviser Samuel R. "Sandy" Berger is traveling to Moscow later this week. His visit is to prepare for a meeting between Clinton and Yeltsin later this month when leaders of the Group of Seven industrialized nations gather in Birmingham, England.

Russia, with its still-struggling economy, is not a G-7 member, although it has participated in portions of recent summits, particularly last year's U.S.-hosted gathering at Denver. Yeltsin, according to administration officials, has asked Clinton in recent correspondence to support Russia's full membership in what would become a Group of Eight. While Clinton is eager to integrate Russia into multilateral institutions, the United States is not prepared to offer Russia formal G-7 membership.

The question that hung over the NATO expansion issue -- whether Russia should be viewed as potential ally or potential threat -- has not been entirely answered. Administration officials strike a somewhat boastful tone when noting that the widely predicted Russian backlash over extending NATO membership to Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic never materialized. "There was a premise that was just plain, flat wrong, that NATO would always be seen as a four-letter word in Russia," said one senior administration official.

But Clinton has promised that the first wave of NATO expansion will not be the last, and many experts believe that the next round could be vastly more problematic for Moscow. In particular, membership of the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania -- on Russia's borders and once part of the Soviet Union -- would badly test Russian forbearance, many experts believe.

Dimitri K. Simes, a prominent Russian analyst at the Nixon Center for Peace and Freedom and a supporter of the

first round of NATO expansion, said, "Once you start talking about the Balts, and to some extent Ukraine, it's a totally different story." NATO membership for these nations, he said, could lead Russia to "abandon its current moderation" and give leverage to those Russian leaders who are "more assertive, and more prepared to stand up to the United States."

Administration officials said they have not decided how quickly to push for a second round of NATO expansion, or whether they will seek to have the Baltic states included in that. But they play down the risks that Simes and others mention, arguing that Russian anxiety about NATO may have reached its apogee.

"The process of enlargement is ongoing," said Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott. "No one's going to be excluded on the basis of geography or history. And there's no reason why the second round should be any more difficult or controversial than the first. In fact, it should be easier."

Former defense secretary William J. Perry, who ran the Pentagon in Clinton's first term and is now a Stanford University faculty member, said Russian fear of NATO has receded in part because of shared experiences, such as the Russian partnership with the NATO peacekeeping force in Bosnia.

Perry likewise played down some of the recent bumps in the Russia relationship. He predicted that START II is likely to pass soon in the Duma, as more Russians awaken to the fact that the treaty is in their self-interest, although he said he is generally opposed to using summits as a way to force actions by other countries.

And he said recent tensions over Iraq and Yugoslavia are an evolution of the U.S.-Russia relationship, not a reversion to Cold War antagonisms. "Russia

NOTICE TO READERS

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

WASHINGTON WHISPERS

You Heard It Here First

It's a tad premature to speculate about who might become next chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. (Gen. Hugh

Shelton, the current chairman, has only been on the job since last fall, and the earliest the post might come open is 17 months from now.) But what the heck: Insiders are mentioning NATO commander Gen. Wesley Clark. Clark is already well acquainted with President

Clinton, and like Clinton is a Rhodes scholar from Arkansas. The general's aggressive pursuit of accused war criminals in Bosnia has also won him important friends in the administration, including Secretary of State Madeleine Albright.

is developing its own voice," Perry said. "It's developing an identity more like a France, which is a friendly country but has its own interests" that sometimes run counter to Washington's.

Washington Times

May 4, 1998

Pg. 1

U.S. firms make China more dangerous

Technology aid helps missiles reach America

By Bill Gertz
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

U.S. satellite companies helped China "perfect" its strategic missiles through technology transferred with the approval of the Clinton administration, according to a senior House member.

Rep. Dana Rohrabacher said Beijing's strategic rockets were unable to target the United States effectively five years ago but benefited greatly in the past several years by acquiring technology with both commercial and military applications.

"I am very sad to say [the Chinese] now have the capability of landing nuclear weapons in the United States and we are the ones who perfected their rockets," the chairman of the House Science subcommittee on space and aeronautics said in a floor speech Thursday.

Mr. Rohrabacher, California Republican, said until last year the space boosters known as Long March were unreliable and three out of five attempts to launch the boosters ended in failure. The rockets were "upgraded" after several U.S. corporations provided information last year on their flaws, Mr. Rohrabacher said.

Technology experts say space launch technology is identical to that used by strategic missiles. In fact, China's premier manufacturer of Long March boosters makes long-range nuclear missiles for the military.

Mr. Rohrabacher said he is investigating claims that several U.S. companies helped improve Chinese missiles by supplying "stage-separation" technology — the capability used to assist rocket or missile stages break away smooth-

ly during launch.

More alarming are reports that the Chinese have acquired the technology used to "dispense" satellites in space once they reach orbit. Such technology is identical to that used in launching multiple, independently targetable re-entry vehicles, the so-called MIRV multiple-warheads, he said.

Senior House members, including Speaker Newt Gingrich, were briefed last week on the issue and have asked the administration to explain how the missile technology leaked out. The Science and National Security committees are expected to hold hearings sometime during the next several weeks, House aides said.

The Justice Department is investigating whether Hughes Electronics Corp. and Loral Space & Communications Ltd. improperly supplied dual-use space and strategic missile know-how to China following the 1996 launch failure of a Long March rocket that crashed with a \$200 million U.S. satellite on board.

A secret Pentagon report on the companies' technology transfer determined that "United States national security has been harmed," according to U.S. officials who have seen the report.

Mr. Rohrabacher said Mr. Clinton and his administration "have been doing everything they can to quash the investigation." He said the probe was undermined two months ago when Mr. Clinton approved the export to China of similar dual-use technology. The story was first disclosed in the New York Times April 13.

Mr. Rohrabacher also said Loral Chief Executive Officer Bernard Schwartz was the largest individual contributor to the Democratic Party in 1996.

The help provided to the Chinese was a "betrayal of American aerospace workers" who lost out in the exchange, Mr. Rohrabacher

said. It also "put us all in the cross-hairs of a communist government which, thanks to this assistance, now has the ability not just to put satellites into space but to deliver nuclear weapons to a majority of American cities," he said.

A CIA report sent to senior U.S. policymakers last month said that China now has 13 of its 18 long-range CSS-4 strategic missiles pointed at the United States.

Mr. Rohrabacher said his investigation into the matter was prompted by an executive from a U.S. aerospace company involved in "upgrading" the Chinese missile capability, who said the firm was operating under a "national security waiver" signed by President Clinton. Mr. Rohrabacher said later in an interview that the company was Motorola Corp. He did not identify the executive.

The launch of U.S. satellites was banned in 1989 under sanctions imposed after the bloody crackdown on unarmed protesters in Beijing's Tiananmen Square by the People's Liberation Army. Some launches have been permitted under White House waivers that Clinton administration officials claim are carried out under strict controls to prevent the technology from being leaked to the Chinese.

U.S. intelligence agencies have said Chinese strategic missiles lacked multiple-warhead capabilities but that new systems are expected to have the advanced several-warhead configurations.

"So the American companies proceeded to provide stage-separation technology, as well as technology that enabled a rocket to spit out satellites, or nuclear warheads, whichever the communist Chinese might want to use on any particular day," Mr. Rohrabacher said.

The Loral and Hughes scientists who gave the Chinese the missile know-how "charged forward to correct the problems of the Long March," he said.

India claims Beijing placed nukes in Tibet

NEW DELHI (Agence France-Presse) — Defense Minister George Fernandes said yesterday that China had deployed nuclear missiles in Tibet and that New Delhi would make its own nuclear weapons if it ran out of options.

"China is potential threat No. 1," the defense minister told the private Home TV network.

"The potential threat from China is greater than that from Pakistan, and any person who is concerned about India's security must agree with that fact," it quoted Mr. Fernandes as saying.

His statement came hard on the heels of the first-ever visit to India by a chief of the Chinese army, Gen. Fu Quanyou.

India exploded a nuclear device in 1974. It fought a brief but bitter border war with China in 1962 that led to a 14-year diplomatic freeze.

India has also fought three wars with Pakistan since 1947.

Replying to questions about

reports of a Chinese military buildup around India, Mr. Fernandes said Beijing had deployed nuclear missiles in Tibet.

"China has its nuclear weapons stockpiled in Tibet right along India's borders," he was quoted as saying.

Mr. Fernandes also said China had expanded its military airfields in Tibet in the last six months.

He said there was "a lot of naval activity" off the coast of Burma, including the construction of harbors on Burmese islands where Chinese ships could be berthed.

"And [China's] senior officials have said that the Indian Ocean is not India's ocean. There is no doubt in my mind that China's fast-expanding navy, which will be the biggest in this part of the world, will be getting into the Indian Ocean fairly soon."

Mr. Fernandes, a firebrand socialist in India's new coalition government, said China was training Burma's army and had set up a "massive electronic surveillance establishment" on Burma's Coco Islands on the northern tip of India's Andaman and Nicobar islands.

"These are Burmese territory. China has taken them on loan. Already there is a massive electronic surveillance establishment which

the Chinese have installed.

"There are moves to convert that into a major naval base which would be a direct threat to us," he said.

Sino-Indian tensions have eased after a series of high-level visits, which began in 1988, but disputes over their border persist.

India says China still holds 16,000 square miles of its territory at Aksai Chin in Kashmir. China lays claim to a swathe of Indian territory in the far eastern state of Arunachal Pradesh.

Mr. Fernandes, speaking about India's policy on China, said: "I think there is a reluctance to face the reality that China's intentions need to be questioned."

"This is where our country has made mistakes in the past. We made those mistakes in the early 1950s. We paid the price in the 1960s. And I think things have not changed."

On India's nuclear policy, Mr. Fernandes told the television network that India "is taking the inevitable next step. We have come to a point where we believe we need to make a review of the defense policy."

Mr. Fernandes added, however, that India would build nuclear weapons only after a strategic review.

GAO: International Scudbuster Among Costliest Programs

By John Donnelly

Congress's watchdog agency has for the first time reckoned the costs and risks of one of the Pentagon's most cherished international cooperative programs, and the result has left a top lawmaker in sticker shock.

Analysts from the General Accounting Office last week briefed the chairman of the House National Security Committee's research panel, Rep. Curt Weldon (R-Pa.), on a new draft report looking at the Army's Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS).

The analysts told Weldon the system could cost the U.S. \$18 billion to acquire and support, making it potentially one of the Pentagon's costliest programs, the lawmaker said in an interview. And, in what could prove to be an important prob-

lem, the analysts warned that U.S. reluctance to share key technology with its partners, Italy and Germany, could be what Weldon called "a major stumbling block" to fielding the system.

"You're talking about a major, major program here," said Weldon. "In fact, estimates of this program through actual acquisition are going to run close to...\$18 billion....Isn't that unbelievable? That's a huge amount of money."

The Pentagon touts MEADS as a flagship of transatlantic cooperation and a "critical" capability. In recent years, top civilian and uniformed leaders have repeatedly plucked MEADS from the edge of the cliff just as Congress was poised to push. Ironically, however, the Pentagon has no funding for the effort in its future budgets and is in the throes

of deciding whether and how to pay the bill.

Paying bills

The Ballistic Missile Defense Organization (BMDO), in a statement, said the agency and GAO agree that the program would cost about \$12 billion to acquire.

But Weldon said the \$18 billion, which includes operations and support, was given to him verbally and is not in the GAO report. Moreover, while the Pentagon's figures may well agree with GAO's, they have never been publicized and were certainly not clear to Congress.

While MEADS's costs are not going to overshadow the \$63 billion New Attack Submarine or F-22 fighter, the \$12 billion acquisition costs, which could well go up, approach the \$15 billion needed to buy the controversial Theater High Altitude Area Defense anti-missile system. Even the "Star Wars" National Missile De-

fense program is officially penciled in for a mere \$6.2 billion.

The MEADS effort is currently in the "definition and validation" phase. The next phase, "design and development," would run from 2000 to 2005. The U.S. share of the next phase originally was to be \$1.8 billion, but officials are discussing a reduction to perhaps \$1 billion. They are also trying to figure out whether the Army will pick up more of that tab instead of BMDO.

The new GAO numbers look a little further down the line, to around 2014, and show the rest of the iceberg.

Weldon, like Sen. Ted Stevens (R-Alaska), chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, supports the program but wants to see the Pentagon's plans to pay for it. As a result of GAO's findings, Weldon said the fiscal 1999 defense authorization bill his panel will mark up next week will probably "fence" the \$43

million MEADS request, pending a Pentagon report on addressing the "outyear" problem.

'Underfunded'

This is the "first ever" cost estimate for MEADS, Weldon said. Officials have been reluctant to discuss total costs while the program is being defined.

"We were always assured by the administration that it was a low-cost program and part of that was they didn't want it to get mixed up in...our criticism of their missile defense funding profiles," said Weldon. "They are all grossly underfunded."

In addition, the GAO affirmed the Pentagon view that the requirement for a mobile antimissile system that can fit on a C-130 and protect maneuvering forces is a valid one. They said, too, that MEADS alone could meet that need, whereas many have argued that other systems, such as a more

mobile Patriot or more efficient sensor-netting, could meet the need.

Of the \$18 billion cost, Weldon said: "There's nowhere near...the money necessary to take care of this. It's another example of this administration playing games, leading our allies and our troops to think we're serious about protecting you from Scud-type missiles. There's no way we can fund this kind of a program, given the budget projection for BMDO for five years, and even BMDO knows that. They're back up right now with the Secretary of Defense trying to negotiate the numbers to meet their requirements for MEADS and all the other programs."

Tech transfer

Weldon thinks concern about technology transfer is warranted, but that it still poses a threat to cooperation.

"MEADS is going to require some potential capabilities of

PAC-3 [the Patriot upgrade] and THAAD [the Theater High Altitude Area Defense]," he said, describing GAO's findings. "And neither of those programs is willing to put those into the mix. And so before MEADS can go forward, we've got to resolve with the Germans and the Italians our limitations on the technology that we develop. And I agree with that, but that could be a major stumbling block here as well."

As for the upcoming markup, Weldon said: "We are going to put MEADS money in, but based on what I've heard from GAO, we'll probably either fence the money or do something else to force the administration to come out of their shell and talk about how they are going to pay for this."

The GAO told Weldon that "the contractors will come in lower" than the \$18 billion but that "contractors usually underestimate costs and come in with higher amounts when they get

in production. And I tend to agree with them on that. So the contractors will say it's way out of line. The number is perhaps on the high end, but it's important to know what the high-end costs could be."

The missile-defense agency's statement described the costs as follows: "The U.S. cost of MEADS design and development phase from FY99 to FY07 is \$1.81 billion. This assumes a 50 percent cost share with the allies, which brings the total RDT&E cost estimate to \$3.62 billion. Procurement for 8 US battalions is estimated to be \$10B over the FY05 to FY14 time period." The BMDO then added that it was trying to reduce these costs.

A company called Euro-meads—comprising Daimler Benz, Siemens and Alenia—will team with either Lockheed Martin or Raytheon to develop the system. The U.S. winner will be picked in December 1998.

Washington Post

May 4, 1998

Pg. 1

Gore Tour Spurs Hope Of Arabs

Talks With Albright Gain Significance

By Thomas W. Lippman
Washington Post
Staff Writer

CAIRO, May 3—No matter how much the participants insist that Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright's meetings in London Monday with the leaders of Israel and the Palestinians are not make-or-break sessions, the events surrounding Vice President Gore's regional swing have combined to make them seem crucial to the prospects for Middle East peace.

Gore contributed to the sense of anticipation here and elsewhere in the Arab world by observing today that "the stage is set for progress in these discussions that would have significant leverage over the future of the entire region."

He called the London session a historic opportunity for both sides to reach an agreement that would unlock the door to the long-elusive regional peace between Israel and its Arab neighbors.

Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak took a similar tone.

"We hope from our hearts," he said, "that the London meetings will be a success, because [if not] we fear what will happen after that."

Gore arrived here early this morning after an extraordinary, two-hour, unscheduled meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu that ended at about 4 a.m. with an emotional embrace on the tarmac of Ben-Gurion airport.

Gore sought that meeting after talks with Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat, who has endorsed a U.S. plan to get Israeli-Palestinian peace talks back on track by increasing the amount of West Bank land that Israel would turn over to Palestinian control.

Arafat in turn flew here to see Mubarak after the Egyptian leader's meeting with Gore, a sequence of events that inevitably stirred speculation in the Arab press that something big is afoot -- which is not to say analysts predicted a positive outcome.

"The celebrations are extraordinary," wrote columnist Salama Ahmen Salama in

Egypt's pro-government newspaper al-Ahram. "Vice President Gore is attending the [50th anniversary] celebrations in Jerusalem as Secretary Albright is holding talks with Israel's leader in London. While she is crying over the sad state of peace, Arabs stand in despair, not knowing which way to turn."

Gore has said repeatedly that he is not in the Middle East "as a negotiator," but he did urge Arafat and Netanyahu to seize an opportunity that may not repeat itself, according to a senior administration official.

"You have to make the effort," the official said Gore told them. "Think outside the box. Don't let the moment pass; it may not come again."

David Bar-Illan, a spokesman for Netanyahu, was quoted by wire services today saying that it would be "utterly impossible" for Israel to accept the U.S. plan, which would transfer an additional 13 percent of the West Bank to Palestinian rule. Israel is reportedly prepared to offer no more than 9 percent, a figure Arafat

rejected.

Albright's spokesman, James P. Rubin, said she has heard nothing from Gore or from Middle East envoy Dennis Ross to suggest that the London meetings will end the stalemate. But the events of the past two days, combined with Gore's words, have convinced many in the Arab world that a defining moment is at hand.

Saudi Arabia, where Gore spent six hours in private talks with Crown Prince Abdullah, published a statement about the meeting saying that Gore "updated the Saudi side on America's vigorous efforts to put the peace process back on track, including details of planned meetings in London" between Albright and the Israeli and Palestinian leaders.

"Saudi Arabia expressed its full support for the peace efforts exerted by the United States and Saudi Arabia's willingness to support whatever the Palestinian side agrees to in the service of peace," the document said. "Saudi Arabia expects the two sides to strictly abide by their obligations" under the Oslo peace accords, which call for a further Israeli redeployment on the West Bank followed by negotiations on the "final status" of the West

Bank and Jerusalem.

As U.S. officials have been pointing out with increasing frequency, those "final status" talks are scheduled to be completed by May 4, 1999, a year from the day of the London meeting. Albright, Ross and others have been citing that date to underscore the importance of a breakthrough, if not Monday, then soon after.

Washington Times

May 2, 1998

Pg. 7

Kazakhstan Says India Wants To Buy 40 Migs

Almaty, Kazakhstan -- Kazakhstan's Defense Ministry says India wants to buy 40 MiG fighters the Central Asian state inherited from the Soviet Union.

"India wants to buy 40 training aircraft," Amangeldy Kozhibayev, deputy defense minister in charge of economics, told a news conference this week. He said the planes for sale are outdated MiG-21, MiG-23 and MiG-25 fighters Kazakhstan inherited from the Soviet Un-

ion after its collapse in 1991.

But an army colonel representing the defense minister said after the news conference the "training jets" could easily be upgraded to carry arms. The Kazakh military calls any aircraft sold without regular arms "trainers."

U.S. To Press For Funding From Kuwait

European Stars & Stripes

May 4, 1998 Pg. 5

KUWAIT (AP) — Seven U.S. senators arrived in Kuwait on Saturday for talks with the government that are expected to focus on funding for American military missions.

The American Embassy said the delegation, headed by the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, Sen. Ted Stevens, would visit U.S. airmen and meet Crown Prince Sheik Saad al-Abdallah al-

Sabah, who also is the prime minister.

The embassy would not elaborate on the purpose of the visit, but Stevens, R-Alaska, said in Washington last week that the group was going to push America's allies in the Middle East to provide funds for the U.S. military missions in the region.

Stevens has been a leading Senate critic of the low level of financial support from Amer-

ica's allies, particularly in confronting Iraq's Saddam Hussein. "We just cannot afford to go it alone any longer," he told The Associated Press in Washington.

The senators, accompanied by Assistant Secretary of Defense Sandra Stuart, were scheduled to leave for Saudi Arabia on Sunday.

More than 8,000 U.S. military personnel are now in Kuwait. Most arrived earlier this

year during the standoff between the United Nations and Iraq over Baghdad's refusal to allow U.N. monitors to inspect presidential compounds for evidence of banned weapons programs.

Washington has decided to keep U.S. forces in the Persian Gulf to make sure that Baghdad respects the agreement it signed with U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan in February.

Newsweek

May 11, 1998

EXCLUSIVE

A Secret Nuke Offer?

DID PAKISTAN'S TOP NUCLEAR-WEAPONS SCIENTIST secretly offer to sell Saddam Hussein the designs for an atomic bomb? NEWSWEEK has learned that the International Atomic Energy Agency is investigating an Oct. 6, 1990, memorandum from Section B.15 of Iraq's intelligence service to Section S.15 of its nuclear-weapons directorate. As translated by the IAEA, the memo reports a proposal from "Pak-

istani scientist Dr. Abd-el-Qadeer Khan" to help Iraq "manufacture a nuclear weapon." It was among the documents turned over by Iraq after the 1995 defection of Saddam's son-in-law, Lt. Gen. Hussein Kamel, who ran Iraq's secret weapons program through the 1980s. Last December, Iraqi officials confirmed the memo's authenticity, but said they rejected the offer because they feared it was a "sting." Dr. Khan denies any involvement; Islamabad, after a "thorough investigation," called the matter an act of "fraud." The IAEA is still investigating. "They haven't put it to bed yet," says a U.S. official.

Washington Post

May 4, 1998

Pg. 16

Cyprus Reunification Talks Collapse

U.S. Envoy Blames Hard-Line Position of Turkish Side but Vows Not to Give Up

By Kelly Couturier
Special to The
Washington Post

NICOSIA, Cyprus, May 3— U.S. envoy Richard C. Holbrooke today blamed a hardened stance by the Turkish Cypriots for the collapse of talks aimed at restarting reunification negotiations on this divided island.

"The reason we could not make progress this time around was because the Turkish side has changed its position," Holbrooke said in an exclusive interview after two days of talks with Turkish Cypriot leader Rauf Denktash and Glafcos Clerides, president of the Greek-Cypriot-led govern-

ment.

The U.S. envoy, scheduled to leave Cyprus on Monday, said he would not return later this week as reported earlier. But Holbrooke -- the architect of the 1995 Dayton accords that ended the Bosnian conflict -- said the United States would not "walk away" from the Cyprus problem.

The U.S. engagement on Cyprus, where ethnic Greeks and Turks have been divided since the 1974 war, will continue, Holbrooke said, to prevent tensions from escalating.

He said two days of talks snagged when Denktash laid out two new conditions for restarting reunification negotiations: that the negotiations be

carried out on a state-to-state basis and that Clerides withdraw the Republic of Cyprus's application to join the European Union.

The Turkish side's demand that the EU application be withdrawn was the "deal breaker," a source close to the talks said.

"The answer to the EU problem is not for Cyprus to withdraw its application, but for the EU to make Turkey a candidate as well," Holbrooke said. Washington has been critical of the European Union's decision last December to leave longtime aspiring member Turkey off its short list of candidates.

U.S. officials said privately they feared it would push Turkey and the Turkish Cypriots toward a harder line on Cyprus and other Greek-Turkish disputes. The European Union decided at the same December meeting to begin talks with the government of Cyprus on joining the EU. Denktash and his Turkish ally have been hardening their stance on Cyprus settlement negotiations ever since, as U.S. officials predicted. The Turkish side formalized that stance in this weekend's talks.

Analysts said that the EU decisions and the resulting hardening stance in Turkish-ruled Northern Cyprus have brought the 24-year-old problem to a critical point.

"We are in a defining moment," one Western diplomat said. If Holbrooke's current

effort "doesn't yield positive results, we may well have reached a point where the Cyprus problem can't be fixed any more," the diplomat said.

Holbrooke is the latest in a string of negotiators to attempt to mediate a solution to the longstanding problem. His mediation efforts this weekend -- billed as his first big push on the issue -- are part of a concerted U.S. effort to reduce tensions between Greece and Turkey, two NATO members that, as one U.S. official put it, have been "squabbling with each other in unseemly, provocative and dangerous ways."

Tensions have escalated over the planned delivery to the

Greek Cypriot government late this summer of Russian S-300 surface-to-air missiles.

Turkey, which maintains 35,000 troops in the northern part of the island, has said it may take action to prevent the deployment of the missiles. U.S. officials -- including Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright, who is due in the region later this month -- are expected to continue diplomatic efforts to stop the missile delivery.

"We don't think the missiles should be delivered," Holbrooke said after the talks. "We think they're a bad idea."

Denktash warned of his side's hard line early in Hol-

brooke's shuttle diplomacy across the U.N. buffer zone that divides the island. He told reporters that in one of his early meetings with Holbrooke, he had told the envoy "we exist and we are going to exist as the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. If you want Cyprus to be united, two states are ready to unite. If not, let Cyprus be divided," the Turkish Cypriot leader said.

Only Turkey recognizes the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. The breakaway state was declared in the northern third of the island after a brief war in the summer of 1974 that was sparked by a Greek-backed coup and a Turkish military

invasion.

The Greek Cypriot government was tight-lipped in the days leading up to the talks, saying through spokesman Christos Stylianides only that "the Cyprus government is consistent on its position on the resumption of negotiations. It seeks the resumption of talks under the auspices of the United Nations aimed at a bizonal bicommunal federation."

Holbrooke, who stressed that the United States was working closely with the United Nations, said the Greek Cypriots would have to adjust their position if "real negotiations for a reunification settlement get going."

European Stars & Stripes

May 4, 1998

Pg. 1

War Crimes Suspect Plotting Revenge

Karadzic strategy links Yugoslav leader to massacres

By Dusan Stojanovic
The Associated Press

PALE, Bosnia and Herzegovina — Deep in hiding, Bosnia's No. 1 war crimes suspect reportedly is plotting revenge on his former patron, planning testimony implicating Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic in wartime atrocities.

According to a book that outlines Radovan Karadzic's defense strategy, the Bosnian Serbs' wartime leader can even corroborate Western intelligence reports linking Milosevic directly to the massacre of thousands of Muslims from Srebrenica — possibly Europe's worst horror since the crimes of World War II.

Karadzic, 54, recently fled his stronghold village of Pale, just east of Sarajevo, and is believed to be hiding elsewhere in Bosnia, considering a surrender to NATO-led peacekeepers. For now, however, hard-line allies and his wife, Ljiljana, have talked him out of it.

Karadzic indirectly has contacted several American and Greek lawyers to represent him at the U.N. war crimes tribunal in The Hague, Netherlands, sources close to him said.

The sources — who spoke on condition of anonymity for security reasons — said two Greek lawyers, whom they

declined to name, had accepted.

The sources said Karadzic could heavily implicate Milosevic, who is widely blamed for instigating the Croatian and Bosnian wars but has not been publicly indicted by the U.N. tribunal.

Karadzic apparently wants revenge. Milosevic, who backed him militarily and politically for most of the war, dumped Karadzic in 1995 before signing a U.S.-sponsored peace plan.

Karadzic also plans to shift blame to his wartime military commander, Gen. Ratko Mladic. The tribunal has charged both men with genocide and crimes against humanity for the deaths of thousands of non-Serbs and for driving tens of thousands from their homes in a campaign of "ethnic cleansing."

Mladic, believed to be living in the Yugoslav capital, Belgrade, has been in the limelight far less than Karadzic.

It was not known whether Karadzic was hoping for immunity against prosecution in exchange for his testimony or whether the tribunal would grant such a thing.

Outlines of Karadzic's likely defense appear in the book *The Hague Against Justice*, written by prominent Belgrade legal expert Kosta Cavoski, a close friend and

Karadzic ally, and circulated in Bosnia in recent months.

The small, blue tome is thought to have been funded by Karadzic, and it contains copies of his written orders to Mladic to obey international war conventions, let humanitarian and Red Cross convoys pass freely, disband Serbian paramilitary units and arrest Serbian soldiers who commit war crimes.

A section of the book defends Karadzic against charges that he is responsible for the deaths of thousands of Muslims when Serbian troops overran the eastern Bosnian enclave of Srebrenica in July 1995.

By then, it says, Karadzic had lost control of the Bosnian Serbian army to Mladic. Milosevic, it claims, commanded regular Serbian troops and paramilitaries also involved in the massacre.

"Whereas earlier Dr. Karadzic did have a degree of control over the military top brass and the field commanders of the (Bosnian) Serb army, at the time of operations around

Srebrenica and immediately after, these field commanders rebelled completely against civilian control," says the book, made available to The Associated Press.

At the time, Milosevic "was on the side of Ratko Mladic and against Dr. Karadzic," the book adds.

"Armies never have two commanders, so if Serbian forces in Srebrenica were not under the control of Dr. Karadzic, this means they had to be under the control of that different commander," the book says. "That different commander ... could be no other than Slobodan Milosevic."

New reformist Bosnian Serbian Premier Milorad Dodik confirmed in an interview that he heard Karadzic was preparing his defense, saying it would be "better for everyone" if he gave himself up.

The Pale sources said Karadzic is considering surrender. He remains quite popular among Bosnian Serbs, making it risky to snatch him — even if NATO knows where he is.

Sources said he moves around, guarded by about 200 security men.

European Stars & Stripes May 4, 1998 Pg. 5

Yugoslav Army Clashes With Weapons Smugglers

PRISTINA, Yugoslavia (AP) — In a new crackdown on Kosovo militants, the Yugoslav army fought gun

smugglers on the border with Albania and forced them to flee, army sources said Sunday.

An unspecified number of alleged smugglers, carrying "a

large quantity of weapons" tried Saturday and Sunday to cross the border from Albania into Kosovo province, part of the Yugoslav republic of Serbia, the sources said.

The Serbian government's press office, citing the unnamed sources, said the skirmishes occurred 44 miles southwest of Pristina, capital of Kosovo province, where ethnic Albanians are in the 90 percent majority.

The press office of the Kosovo Albanian leadership confirmed skirmishes in the

region, saying detonations were heard Sunday near the village of Junik.

Artillery and machine gun fire also was heard from Ponosevac, another border village. Unconfirmed reports said the Yugoslav army was responding to an Albanian attack on the Serbian police station there.

The army reportedly had no casualties in the weekend shootout and was searching the area for Albanian dead or wounded. There was no information on whether the al-

leged smugglers had fled back into Albania or had dispersed in Kosovo.

A total of 157 incidents, most involving arms smuggling, have occurred this year along the 195-mile stretch of the Yugoslav-Albanian border, said the state-run Tanjug news agency late Saturday. At least 23 people have died in border clashes, it said.

Also Sunday, about 1,500 independence-minded Kosovo Albanians held their 24th daily march in downtown Pristina.

The independence movement has grown stronger, and a western area of Kosovo is virtually controlled by the clandestine and militant Liberation Army.

Punishing Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic, whom the West holds responsible for the spiral of violence, the United States and its allies last week agreed on sanctions against Serbia.

The Serbian government has protested, saying it was only protecting its territory.

New York Times

May 4, 1998

On Local Level, Bosnians Are Learning To Get Along

By Mike O'Connor

VARES, Bosnia -- The political changes that have taken place in this town are signaled in the surprising new relationship between two men. From war-time enemies they have become the mayor and deputy mayor and they are trying to learn something new for Bosnia: how to share political power.

Before the 1992-95 Bosnian war, the town, like all of Yugoslavia, was under one-party Communist rule. During the war, that party was replaced in this town by a nationalist party run by and for Muslims. Now the long desk in the city hall's conference room is decorated with the flags of the five parties represented on the city council.

But, more importantly, the changes are evident in the ease with which the two former enemies share the long desk, and how they seem to believe that, while the national leaders of their respective political parties continue to obstruct cooperation, most of the ordinary people they serve in this town want to get along with one another.

And so, Mayor Samir Musa, 34, a Muslim, and Deputy Mayor Pavle Vidovic, 57, a Croat, sat together at the desk recently, joking about their new coalition city government.

"We think we have a good combination of youth and experience," Vidovic said.

Added Musa, "Now that we are working together we find there are fewer and fewer

things to keep us apart."

For all their apparent sincerity, the two men, and the city government itself, only began working after Western officials overseeing the implementation of the 1995 peace accord forced them to. To a greater or lesser degree, what happened here in Vares has begun in 131 of the 136 local governments in Bosnia, almost always because of the demands of foreign mediators.

Western governments, exercising a new assertiveness and a broader interpretation of their powers to oversee the peace here, are using threats of dismissal and promises of aid to get even the most unwilling local politicians to cooperate.

The sharing of power, though often superficial, seems to be the beginning of joint local administrations to replace those created during the war, which were almost always made up exclusively of officials from whatever ethnic group had seized control of the area.

Local elections last fall gave many posts to members of an ethnic group that had been expelled during the war. Often the political party in power refused to let the newly elected officials take office. There have been more than six months of table-pounding acrimony as Bosnian politicians and foreign officials negotiated the composition of local governments.

Some foreign officials question how democratic their own methods are, and they wonder how enduring the changes they dictate will be.

"It troubles me that the less democratically we act, the more success we have," said one such official. "I mean, here we are with 32,000 foreign soldiers demanding that a country do what we want."

"But, he added, "the results are good."

On the national level, Bosnia remains terribly fractured. It is divided into two semi-autonomous areas which hardly cooperate at all. One is dominated by Serb politicians. The other, the Muslim-Croat federation, has government offices generally apportioned by ethnicity but is controlled by two antagonistic nationalist parties and riven by bickering.

Foreign diplomats hope that the cooperation that is beginning in local governments will work its way up through the whole political system.

In many towns foreign officials disregarded the election results somewhat and ordered that minority ethnic groups have enough seats on the local council to feel secure that the government would not abuse them.

Even when local officials agreed among themselves how to share power it was often because they knew the alternative was to have a formula imposed on them.

The formula worked out for Vares was this: For now the mayor is a Muslim and the deputy mayor a Croat, but every five months they switch.

"When I am the mayor I have to be fair," said Musa. "Because I know that in a few months my deputy will become

my boss."

Three of the city's departments are run by Croats and three by Muslims.

Distributing power this way runs counter to the Bosnian political philosophy of winner take all, in which the party with the most seats in a government body gets to control everything. It also, foreign officials concede, violates Bosnian law.

But the 1995 Dayton peace agreement supersedes all Bosnian laws and increasingly Western governments are interpreting that agreement to impose their views of how the country should be run.

In the area around Vares, with city hall becoming a laboratory for the experiment in power-sharing, the atmosphere of fear is starting to dissipate. In a nearby village, Muslim soldiers withdrew from a base that guarded what had been the front line. And Croats, who had feared the soldiers, are now returning to the village.

Even so, in other towns, political parties have allowed their opponents to take office but not enjoy much power.

In the town of Drvar, which had been predominantly Serb before the war, the Croat leaders agreed only recently to accept the Serb who had been elected mayor. But when he encouraged some of the original Serb residents of the town to return, Croat officials did not stop a campaign to intimidate the returning Serbs. Foreign monitors ordered the firing of three of the Croat officials after an elderly Serb couple was murdered.

Defense investigation of general finished

Woman claims he coerced her for sex

By Rowan Scarborough
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

The Pentagon inspector general has wrapped up an investigation into a woman's claim that a two-star general pressured her into a sexual relationship in Turkey in 1997, according to sources close to the probe.

The case has drawn intense Defense Department scrutiny because Gen. Dennis Reimer, Army chief of staff, allowed the accused, Maj. Gen. David R. Hale, to honorably retire in February while the investigation was still under way.

Sources said the IG report by three investigators is now being reviewed internally before submission to Defense Secretary William S. Cohen. One source said Gen. Hale declined to comment to investigators.

Investigators have been looking into the possibility that Gen. Hale, a West Point graduate who headed a NATO command, used his authority to pressure sex from Donnamaria Carpino, who was married at the time to a colonel under the general's command. Mrs. Carpino also charges that Gen. Hale used government funds to visit her in Connecticut and revealed classified information.

Gen. Hale's attorney has declined to comment on her claims.

IG investigators are in possession of a letter Mrs. Carpino says Gen. Hale forced her to write in June, her last month in Turkey. In

the handwritten letter she mailed to Gen. Hale, Mrs. Carpino said she wrote that she and the general maintained a "platonic" relationship and never had sexual relations.

"The letter is the smoking gun that proves that Hale was guilty," said Charles Gittins, her attorney. "An innocent man doesn't need that letter."

After The Washington Times first reported Mrs. Carpino's case on March 27, Mr. Cohen ordered department General Counsel Judith Miller to investigate the abrupt retirement.

Mrs. Carpino has quoted an officer inside the general counsel's office as saying its inquiry is restricted to determining the adequacy of lines of communication between the IG's office and Gen. Reimer's staff.

But Mr. Cohen told reporters on Thursday, "It would encompass everything."

The defense secretary disclosed that he personally discussed the matter with Gen. Reimer.

"The investigation is ongoing," he said. "I expressed my own concern about the matter once it was raised and I became aware of it. I have talked with Gen. Reimer and others and I can tell you the investigation continues, and as soon as it's completed we'll have an opportunity to make a recommendation."

The case has raised suspicions of a "double standard" in light of the fact the Army vigorously punishes enlisted personnel for sexual misconduct but let Gen. Hale quietly retire. At the time, Gen. Hale was the Army's deputy inspector general at the Pentagon in charge

of inquiries into personnel misconduct.

Rep. Carolyn B. Maloney, New York Democrat, wrote Mr. Cohen April 24 telling of her "grave concerns about the seriousness with which the DoD regards" sexual harassment.

"I want your personal assurance that this case will be thoroughly investigated and not swept under the rug due to the high rank of the officer accused and his relationship with Gen. Reimer," Mrs. Maloney said.

"Even more upsetting is the unusually rapid and unexpected retirement of Hale, as an investigation was under way," she wrote. "I understand that if a retired officer must face military criminal charges, he may be forced back to active duty. However, I also understand that this has never happened in the history of the U.S. Army."

No Army official will be quoted by name in commenting on the case. But a written Army statement defends Gen. Reimer by saying that although he knew Gen. Hale was under investigation he didn't know the seriousness of the charges. Privately, officials also have characterized Mrs. Carpino as a sexual "stalker," a charge she denies.

She and her husband divorced last fall, and both blame Gen. Hale for the breakup.

Mrs. Carpino said Gen. Hale forced her into a sexual relationship by telling her he would protect her husband from adultery charges if she cooperated. She said she initially believed him, but now says the charges were made up.

Wall Street Journal

May 4, 1998

Pg. 3

U.S. Seeks Ban On Disclosing Lockheed Data

By JEFF COLE

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL
WASHINGTON — The government wants to prevent any disclosure of thousands of documents relating to the Pentagon's opposition to Lockheed Martin Corp.'s \$8.3 billion purchase of Northrop Grumman Corp., according to recent fil-

ings in federal court.

If the companies can't force the government to give up the documents, it could seriously hobble their courtroom battle to proceed with the merger, say legal experts and attorneys familiar with the case.

The move by Justice Department prosecutors to declare the documents "privileged," thus preventing Lockheed and Northrop from seeing them, will be the subject of a hearing Wednesday in federal court here.

Lockheed, a Bethesda, Md., maker of military aircraft, weapons and other defense systems, announced plans to buy its smaller Los Angeles-based rival last July. In March, the Defense and Justice departments shocked the defense industry by announcing that they would oppose the

transaction for antitrust and national-security reasons.

The companies have challenged the decision, and a trial is set to begin Sept. 8. But the two aerospace companies could be disadvantaged if they can't examine the Pentagon's documents, to form a strategy for picking apart the government's case.

"A defeat here would greatly wound their effort to defend the transaction," said William Kovacic, a George Mason University Law School professor. Mr. Kovacic says the documents "are likely to indicate any gaps" in Pentagon conclusions about the merger.

In its pleadings, the government asserts that more than 2,100 documents produced by the Pentagon about the Lockheed-Northrop deal are barred from re-

lease under laws that deem such communications privileged to protect the "deliberative process" of federal agencies. The Justice Department also claims many of the Pentagon's papers are covered by attorney-client privilege protection since Pentagon lawyers were involved.

The companies sense there are soft spots in the conclusion by Defense Secretary William Cohen and Attorney General Janet Reno, who say the merger would hurt future competition by reducing the number of military plane makers. The government also contends that it would be anticompetitive to let Lockheed, a maker of planes, combine with the smaller supplier of radars and electronics that go into such aircraft.

The companies contend that competition among military-aircraft makers wouldn't be reduced since Northrop is no longer a viable prime contractor for such work. They also say Lockheed Martin's purchase of the smaller company doesn't mean competitiveness must be sacrificed in airplane-electronics markets.

While senior Pentagon officials have lined up against the merger, Navy officials have indicated privately that they support it, and Air Force officials have said that while they have some concerns, they are "officially neutral" on whether the deal should be allowed to proceed.

With the right documents in hand, it would be much easier in court for the companies' legal team to extract favorable statements from top military officials. Without the documents, the companies' attorneys team must try to get these officials to contradict the stand taken by the defense secretary, Pentagon procurement chief Jacques Gansler and others.

Justice Department antitrust lawyers, on the other hand, want to prevent disclosure for reasons that reach beyond any effect on the current case. The department wants to protect the ability of all government agencies to speak candidly to prosecutors and regulators about the effects of private-sector mergers and other matters. Government lawyers also say that Lockheed and Northrop are protesting

a Justice Department decision, not a Pentagon action.

A loss on the privilege issue in this case "could be very damaging" for the government, says Robert Litan, a Brookings Institution analyst and former senior Justice Department attorney. Mr. Litan, who suggests the government will prevail in this instance, says the government is protecting a vital legal privilege.

Lawyers for the companies were said to be pleased with a ruling late last week by U.S. District Judge Emmet Sullivan, who found that the government failed "woefully" in its obligation to describe for Lockheed and Northrop the documents it wants to protect. The judge ordered the government to improve the descriptions.

Nonetheless, Mark Schecter, an attorney with experience in privilege law at the Washington law firm of Howrey & Simon, said the Justice Department is "on pretty solid ground" in its claim, since the privilege involved helps ensure that government employees can "speak frankly and provide their most candid advice and opinion."

USA Today

May 4, 1998

Pg. 3

Today's Army relies on General Washing Tons

By Steven Komarow
USA TODAY

WASHINGTON — The Army has unveiled its latest weapon in the war against ... dirt.

It's a \$400,000, 14-ton washing machine called LADS, for Laundry Advanced System.

With it, two soldiers can take on a battalion of Maytags, washing in one day a week's worth of uniforms for 500 troops. And LADS can rejuvenate the Teflon coating on the Army's weatherproof jackets and pants.

Eight feet wide, 8 feet tall and 20 feet long, each LADS packs into a standard shipping container for rapid deployment by truck, train or ship.

It includes a diesel-powered generator, two huge washer-

dryers and a distillery for purifying and reusing water. The only thing missing is a slot for quarters.

The onboard distillery helps cut water consumption 97% compared with the Army's existing field laundry, reducing the need from 24,000 gallons to 540 gallons for one day's wash. That's about the amount consumed by a dozen 7-pound loads in a typical home washing machine.

LADS cranks out two 200-pound loads an hour, four times the wash of the Army's current M-85 laundry truck, which also has a crew of two.

It uses a commercially available detergent.

Drying is done with centrifugal force, not heat. The spin-dry generates 230 times the

force of gravity. So while the two big stainless-steel drums look inviting for a joy ride, "That would be bad. That would be very bad," said Jonathan Given of the Army's research center in Natick, Mass.

All that force means that the clothes come out rather wrinkled. "It's not for the parade ground," Given said. But the uniforms are freed of lice eggs and other health hazards to troops in the field, he said.

For most of its history, the Army didn't bother with laundries. Until 1901, "the enlisted man had been left to take care of his laundry needs as best he could," according to the official history.

The first mobile field laundries weren't built until World War I. By World War II, there were about 2,000 laundry vans.

Still, soldiers usually did their own wash or waited until their units were taken off the front lines so they could take their clothes into regular laundries built by the Army.

With LADS, the Army hopes to make laundry services available even in locations where water, power and good roads are scarce.

But it has its limits. The system can't operate in freezing weather, unless it's inside a heated tent or building. And it won't work at altitudes above 7,500 feet.

After testing is completed, the Army plans to begin operating the LADS system next year. LADS is built by Guild Associates of Columbus, Ohio. The company will build up to 40 LADS a year.

USA Today

May 4, 1998

Pg. 1

Anti-terror 'czar' to coordinate \$7B effort

By M.J. Zuckerman
USA TODAY

WASHINGTON — With spending on anti-terrorism efforts expected to reach a record \$7 billion next year, the Clinton administration within weeks will unveil a strategy to coordinate a new federal war on terror.

Richard Clarke, 47, a career State Department official and special assistant to the president for national security affairs, will be named the gov-

ernment's first national coordinator — a job dubbed by some as "terrorism czar."

Clarke's job will help develop policy and coordinate anti-terrorism efforts for every branch of the federal government, including the FBI, CIA and departments of Justice, State and Defense.

Shaken by bombings in 1995 in Oklahoma City and at the 1996 Olympics in Atlanta, gov-

ernment spending to thwart terrorism has tripled and, in some agencies, quadrupled since 1995, according to the General Accounting Office.

This quick growth has spawned confusion within the government and criticism by some lawmakers and the GAO that the money is not always being spent effectively.

"The United States is spending billions of dollars annually

to combat terrorism without assurance that the federal funds are focused on the right programs or the right amounts," the GAO's Richard Davis testified last month.

The GAO is Congress' auditing and investigative arm.

Officials at the GAO and within the administration say

privately that there has been duplication of effort in some anti-terrorism areas — such as federal training programs.

Clarke's job will be to sort this out.

"The amount being spent is not as important as identifying where there's a need for spending," says Clarke.

There is concern that some

agencies may be citing terrorism to justify larger budgets.

"When you say 'terrorism,' it makes you relevant and when you're relevant you can justify added budget," says Larry Johnson, a corporate consultant and former State Department coordinator of counterterrorism affairs in the Bush

administration.

At a time when the federal government is shrinking, the war on terrorism is among its fastest-growing segments: 17 agencies are expected to spend \$7 billion in 1999, says a new report from the White House's Office of Management and Budget.

A bottom line in war on terrorism: How to best spend the money

USA Today

May 4, 1998

Pg. 9

By M.J. Zuckerman
USA TODAY

WASHINGTON — As the federal government ratchets up its campaign to combat terrorism, some lawmakers and officials are questioning whether the money dedicated to that effort is being spent wisely.

"Am I concerned about how we're spending all this money? Yes," said Rep. Ike Skelton, D-Mo. "Am I alarmed? I don't know yet."

Skelton has commissioned four General Accounting Office (GAO) studies over the past 12 months. The studies have been critical of the Clinton administration's counterterrorism coordination and expense.

As the federal government shrinks to its smallest size since the early 1970s, federal spending to battle terrorism here and abroad is steadily rising, to about \$7 billion in 1999.

Some say the level is justified.

"We're spending a lot of money on this now just as a form of insurance ... to build the necessary infrastructure," Sen. Judd Gregg, R-N.H., said.

But GAO and administration officials said it's hard to say how much spending really is needed.

A State Department report last week found that terrorist activity

worldwide fell to one of its lowest levels since 1971: There were 221 people killed in 1997, compared with 314 in 1996.

While no one suggests ignoring terrorism, there is concern that some agencies may use the threat as a justification for growth.

"There are a lot of agencies out there now saying, 'Oh, yeah, we have a terrorism role.' But two years ago, they didn't talk about having a role," said Bob Blitzer, supervisor of the FBI's Domestic Terrorism/Counter-Terrorism Planning Section.

In fact, it's unclear which departments are involved. A report by the White House's Office of Management and Budget (OMB) found that 17 agencies have counterterrorism roles. But the GAO, Congress' auditing arm, reported in December that 43 agencies fought terrorism, including the Department of Commerce and the U.S. Postal Service.

An unclassified version of the OMB report detailed 1999 counterterrorism budget requests:

► \$4.4 billion sought by the Pentagon and CIA in the largest effort to track, contain and respond to terrorist acts. The Pentagon recently requested \$49 million to train and

equip 10 National Guard units to respond to attacks involving chemical or biological agents.

► \$725 million sought by the Justice Department and FBI, a four-fold increase since the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995. Justice is the lead agency on any domestic attack.

The FBI has 2,600 agents assigned to counterterrorism, up from about 500 in 1995. The FBI won't say how many of those agents are assigned overseas. About \$30 million is for the FBI's new National Infrastructure Protection Center, responsible for safeguarding the nation's vital services from terrorist attack.

► \$688 million sought by Treasury, the majority of which is for the Secret Service to provide security to the president and dignitaries.

► \$190 million sought by State, which responds to acts of terrorism overseas involving Americans.

► \$295 million sought by Transportation. About a third of that money would pay for the purchase of technology to detect explosives and inspect luggage.

► \$303 million sought by Energy, mostly for physical security at nuclear labs and other protected facilities.

Washington Times

May 4, 1998

Pg. 9

Marines face hearing on Italian accident

CAMP LEJEUNE, N.C. — Two U.S. Marine Corps crewmen this week face a military tribunal investigating an accident in which their surveillance jet severed lift cables at an Italian ski resort,

killing 20 skiers and straining relations between the two countries.

In the first of two military court proceedings scheduled in the case, two Marine airmen manning the rear seats of the EA-6B Prowler are expected to argue they had no control over the streaking aircraft during the

fateful low-level training mission, their attorneys said.

Prosecutors said the jet was flying too low and too fast on Feb. 3 when it severed two gondola cables at a ski resort near Cavalese, Italy, sending skiers on a gondola plunging to their deaths.

Richmond Times-Dispatch

May 2, 1998

Pg. B4

Newport News awarded Nimitz overhaul contract

NEWPORT NEWS — Newport News Shipbuilding has been awarded a contract by the Navy to

refuel and overhaul the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier USS Nimitz, officials said.

The contract, signed Thursday, is valued at \$1.2 billion.

The shipyard said the flattop is the first of its class to undergo such extensive work. The Nimitz

will arrive in May and the work is expected to take about 33 months.

"We are looking forward to the ship retuning to her birthplace for her one and only refueling in a 50-year lifespan," said Mik Petters, Newport News vice president.

Useless Bases

THE U.S. MILITARY force has shrunk dramatically since the end of the Cold War, but the decline in base facilities hasn't kept pace. Between 1989 and 2003, the number of Navy ships will have declined by 46 percent, but berthing space by only 18 percent, the Pentagon reports. Army personnel will be down 42 percent; space for training those personnel, only 7 percent. The reason for the lag is simple: Closing bases is difficult politically.

But the cost of maintaining unneeded bases is high. U.S. military spending is flat, and Congress intends to keep it that way. By beginning now the long process of planning and consultations needed to close surplus facilities, the Pentagon could save \$20 billion by the year 2015, according to Defense Secretary William Cohen. Not to act will require an equivalent cut in readiness, weapons procurement or research.

Mr. Cohen is asking Congress to approve creation of commissions that would implement two new rounds of base closings, in 2001 and 2005. Two past commissions worked well; they used objective criteria to prepare a take-it-or-leave-it hit list that gave

each member of Congress a measure of cover from hometown heat. The Pentagon cooperated with local authorities to promote civilian economic development; on bases closed two years or more, new jobs have been created equivalent to 75 percent of those lost. Savings to the military budget have been substantial.

Congress turned down Mr. Cohen's request last year, and it's balking again now. One ostensible reason is congressional anger at President Clinton's political interference into the last base-closing round. Prior to the 1996 election, Mr. Clinton inexcusably intervened to keep open two big depots in vote-rich California and Texas. An Air Force memo that emerged last week suggested that the White House may still be playing politics with those facilities.

Congress should deal with that situation in whatever way the facts may warrant. But it provides no excuse for inaction on future base closings. The next rounds will take place after Mr. Clinton is no longer president, and Congress can write the rules to eliminate executive-branch discretion if it chooses. If Congress misses this chance, it forfeits any right to complain as America's national security declines due to insufficient resources.

NATO's Achievement

PRESIDENT CLINTON launched NATO enlargement, and a Republican Senate ratified it. This one-two provides a richly bipartisan achievement for American foreign policy. The accession of Hungary, Poland and the Czech Republic amounts to a major expansion of American defense responsibilities, with commensurate risks and costs, some impossible now to calculate. But -- and here is the rationale for enlargement -- it also amounts to an expansion of deterrence, stability and encouragement for democracy in the heart of a continent of paramount American interest and in continuing need of support for these goals.

Opponents of ratification never had the horses in the Senate. Nonetheless, the opponents, in and out of the Senate, did raise serious questions that require unbroken attention. One of the two principal questions concerns those extra risks and costs. The best response to it is that the extension of NATO into the gray area of the new Central European democracies should diminish the strategic uncertainty that is the region's chief threat. With the shrinking of uncertainty comes the containment of the costs and risks.

That is the very premise of the new decision.

The other principal question is whether the movement of NATO hundreds of miles closer to Russia's borders, with further movement perhaps to come, may not provoke Russia into a backward-looking nationalistic policy. It would be foolish to say that Russia, a country still in a vulnerable phase of uprootedness and transition, cannot be further alienated. But that simply makes it prudent to engage with Russia more deeply across the board in order to prevent the opponents' dire forecasts from becoming true by official default. No doubt many Russians would prefer to keep Central Europe a sphere of influence in which traditional Russian security ambitions prevail over the wishes of the new democracies. But the Cold War was fought, on the American side, precisely to prevent that old habit from being sustained.

Meanwhile, no one should think that NATO enlargement has solved the problem of European security. Politically speaking, launching a bold project on the future of Europe is a snap next to dealing with the storm gathering in Kosovo. For the United States and its partners in Europe, the price of yielding to Serbia's power play there is very high.

On NATO, How Will Russia React?

To the Editor:

Whatever other rationalizations are made about it, the underlying theme of the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization is that Central Europe needs protection from Russia (front page, May 1). NATO was established to prevent or resist Russian aggression.

Unless it has changed and is now a general European collective-security system, then Russia is and should be at the center of the debate.

Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright (Op-Ed, April 29) dismisses the idea that something as "distant" as Hungarian membership in

NATO could be linked to Moscow's intransigence on other issues. This will no doubt come as a surprise to the many Russian legislators and policymakers who have made clear that such a link indeed exists. At what point will Ms. Albright realize that NATO expansion is producing an adverse Russian reaction? When the Baltic states join? Does she hope to include Belarus and Ukraine? What would she expect to see as a reaction from Moscow at that point?

THOMAS M. NICHOLS
STEVEN T. ROSS
Newport, R.I., May 1, 1998
The writers are professors of

strategy, United States Naval War College.

Kennan's Warning

To the Editor:

Re "Senate Approves Expansion of NATO by Vote of 80 to 19" (front page, May 1): Isolation and confrontation by an expanding military alliance are not the way to create a friend and ally. Rather this is the way, in the words of George F. Kennan (Op-Ed, Feb. 5, 1997), "to impel Russian foreign policy in directions decidedly not to our liking."

Now that the Senate has acted, those of us who share Mr. Kennan's concern can only cling to the hope that one or more current NATO members will recognize that perpetuating the cold war is unwise and that the best hope for long-term

peace and stability in Europe requires including Russia politically, economically and militarily within the European community. The Partnership for Peace and Russian membership in the European Union will do far more to achieve that objective than the confrontational expansion of NATO.

EUGENE J. CARROLL JR.
Deputy Director Center for Defense Information
Washington, May 1, 1998

Official Cynicism

To the Editor:

Those of us worried by the Senate vote to expand the North Atlantic Treaty Organization find little comfort in Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright's argument (Op-Ed, April 29) that opponents of

NATO expansion "are cynically assuming that Russia will always define its national interests in ways inimical to our own."

In fact, it is the proponents of NATO expansion who have warned about the potential future threat from Russia.

Ms. Albright herself, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last October, suggested that we should not dismiss the possibility that Russia could return to patterns of past behavior.

If Ms. Albright cannot decide whether expansion is directed against the Russians or not, it is not surprising that Moscow finds her explanations of the rationale for expansion

to be cynical.

BRIAN TAYLOR

Somerville, Mass., May 1, 1998

More Than Containment

To the Editor:

Re "Senate Approves Expansion of NATO by Vote of 80 to 19" (front page, May 1): NATO was always more than simply a means to contain the Soviet threat. It also served to end the ongoing European "civil wars," especially the French-German enmity, that had first brought the United States into European affairs. It also helped contain and inte-

grate a new Germany into Europe, as well as maintain an American presence on the Continent.

NATO's enlargement is not a threat to a democratic Russia but a simple acknowledgment that Eastern European countries, so often abandoned by the West during this century, have the right to self-determination and security.

THOMAS A. SCHWARTZ

Washington, May 1, 1998

The writer is an associate professor of history at Vanderbilt University.

Lessons of History

To the Editor:

The lessons that you draw

from history in your opposition to the expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (editorial, April 29) are incomplete.

The major wars that have been fought in Europe in the 20th century began in the region of Central and southeastern Europe precisely when the interests of smaller countries were ignored in favor of their larger neighbors.

THOMAS D. KAUFMANN

Princeton, N.J., April 29, 1998

Editor's Note: The article referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, May 1, 1998, Pg. 1; the Albright op-ed and the editorial appeared April 29, 1998, Pg. 10.

Washington Times

May 2, 1998

How The Air Force Is Preparing Itself For The Future

In a meeting last week with the Defense Writers Group, Gen. Michael Ryan, Air Force chief of staff, discussed a variety of issues of concern to the Air Force. A news account printed in your April 22 issue ("Air Force entices pilots with perks") misrepresented some of Gen. Ryan's remarks, and I believe it is important to clarify for your readers what he said.

First, the report erroneously stated that Gen. Ryan advocated building up more support facilities overseas. In fact, Gen.

Ryan discussed the necessity for the Air Force to invest in a stateside structure that would allow us to improve the way we perform the expeditionary mission our nation has expected of us since the end of the Gulf war. The premise he conveyed to the group is that our base support system needs to make a transition from the post-Cold War model to one that efficiently supports deployments to forward locations.

As an example, he used our deployment into countries where we have to bring in our own security forces, engineers and food-service members to support the deployment. Those deployments leave our home bases stretched thin trying to

Pg. C2

perform daily requirements without enough people. The bottom line: We need to build the depth of support forces at bases in the United States in order to meet our mission requirements around the world.

The second area of concern is in space operations. Gen. Ryan's emphasis here was on developing our capacity for the future as well as operating the systems we already have. Your article attributed a statement to him that "there's no space threat - or capacity to operate up there." Gen. Ryan said that even though we do not have a military requirement to station people in space, we are an aerospace force. Our current space capabilities are intelli-

gence, surveillance and reconnaissance, but our Air Force requires us to look for future space capabilities as well. Rather than splitting air and space forces, Gen. Ryan sees space as one of the core capabilities our Air Force provides to this nation.

Thank you for letting me clarify these important issues for your readers.

Col. Ronald T. Rand
Director of public affairs
Department of the Air Force

Editor's Note: The article referred to appeared in the *Current News Early Bird*, April 22, 1998, Pg. 7.

Washington Times

May 4, 1998

Pg. 17

Defense strategy in outer space

By Philip Gold

BFS. BUR. CORM. QDR. NDP. The letters represent studies—some of the official attempts these last seven years to come to terms with America's post-Cold War defense requirements. Don't worry what they stand for; the world will little note nor long remember what they said here. With the possible exception of the National Defense Panel's Transforming Defense and some think tank nuggets, the Seven Years War over How to Make War has been an exercise in sterility, futility, and (this being the Beltway) Turf Protection uber Alles.

Nor will it cease. Although the next Congressionally-mandated

Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) is three years off, the services are already busily positioning themselves, rather in the manner of political candidates the day after the last election.

The services have good reason to fret the next QDR. Bills will be coming due: too much degraded readiness, too little procurement and modernization, too many good people gone. The old evasion of rationing the poverty among the branches may no longer avail. Indeed, at least a few analysts and senior officers have started suggesting that it's time to reconsider the National Security Act of 1947, which established the modern Defense Department and allocated roles and missions among the

services.

However, there may be another way of nudging and nagging the defense establishment into the 21st century. The concept is simple:

Keep the present structure. But encourage certain evolutions and specializations within and among the services. Let technology drive some developments; let national strategy drive others. The sum of these gradual changes would yield, not a bureaucratic reshuffling (or massacre), but a new defense concept based upon what America needs, not what the services do.

The concept may be called: "Space Force. Peace Force. War-

riors. Guard."

Space Force

In its doctrinal paper, "Global Engagement," the Air Force committed itself to evolve into a "space and air force." In recent months, the service's senior leadership has adopted a go slow stance, in part to emphasize current core competencies, in part because of cultural frictions. (As one recently retired four-star aviator puts it, "The space guys are out of control. They want to do everything at once.")

But the approach is substantially correct. In the 21st century, this country will need a Space Force to conduct offensive and defensive operations in space; to protect commercial and scientific assets on the High Frontier; and to provide the intelligence and communications that the other services require.

Whether the United States engage in long-term military operations short of war may be debated. So may the efficacy of messing in other people's affairs. What is not debatable is the high cost of such operations and the nasty effects on the units and personnel so deployed. Not many grunts re-enlist so they can do a second tour in Bosnia, or pilots because they enjoy circling Iraq. If the U.S. absolutely positively has to do these things, they should be handled by units specially dedicated to and trained for such missions. Further — a practice already firmly established — reserve and National Guard participation should

be maximized.

But perhaps most important: Many functions, from disaster relief to routine security to training of local forces, can and should be privatized. Commercial companies already provide such services in Bosnia and Africa. Privatization is also an excellent way to "recapture" valuable expertise, since many of these companies, executives and employees, are veterans with prior experience in these operations.

Privatization is not without its problems from fairness in contracting to keeping civilians at their posts when the balloon hits the fan. But to the extent that privatization can relieve the burden upon the military, it should be explored.

So should letting somebody besides the Pentagon pay these guys.

Warriors

Since Desert Storm, it has become fashionable to assert that, given the range and lethality of modern weapons, everybody is now a "combatant." This is nonsense. Everybody in uniform is expected to go in harm's way when necessary. But there is a difference — an essential, ineluctable, total difference — between going in harm's way and participation in combat. Those whose task it is to fight, whether active-duty or reserve and National Guard, must not be distracted, save in extremis, by lesser or irrelevant concerns.

Guard

This includes all forces tasked with defense of the American homeland. Obviously, some of these will be space-based. Warriors may also be required. But the preponderance of these forces should come from the National Guard and domestic law enforcement. It may be necessary to establish a Homeland Defense Command to direct their activities, and to co-ordinate with the other defense segments.

Obviously, this proposal does not address some of the defense establishment's long-running disputes, such as whether the nation needs two land forces (the Army and the Marines), whether the Air Force's tactical aviation mission should be turned back to the Army (or turned over to the Navy); and the proper mix of active and reserve forces. Nor does it argue for excessively rigid delineations. Obviously, in a real emergency, you do what needs to be done with what you have available.

However, this proposal does point toward a certain conclusion: That old service disputes may no longer be relevant. This country needs its Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines because it needs its Space Force, its Peace Force, its Warriors, and its Guard.

Within this framework, there's room for everyone.

Philip Gold is director of defense and aerospace studies at the Seattle-based Discovery Institute.

Washington Post May 3, 1998 Pg. C7

'Useful Fools'

By Fred Hiatt

So President Clinton is "encouraged" by Iraqi cooperation with United Nations arms inspectors. This is what he said on Thursday: "We are encouraged by the level of compliance so far with the U.N. inspections and by the evidence that has been educed on the nuclear side that more progress has been made."

What has encouraged him? It can't be the testimony of U.N. inspectors themselves. Their chief, Australian diplomat Richard Butler, reported to the Security Council last week that "virtually no progress" had been made in the past six months, due to Iraqi intransigence and obstruction.

On Tuesday, Ambassador Butler offered an example. Iraq repeatedly has claimed that it

has destroyed all of its chemical and biological weapons. Any shells with mustard gas are gone, Iraq has said; and if they weren't gone, they'd be so old as to be useless by now anyway. Any U.N. claims to the contrary represent "tremendous and flagrant fallacies and lies."

But not long ago, indefatigable U.N. inspectors overcame Iraqi obfuscation and found some mustard-gas shells. When the inspectors drilled inside, they found highly active chemical agent. "We tested them, and the mustard was 97 percent pure," Butler said.

"Ninety-seven percent pure" -- if those words don't chill you, you're not familiar with the fate of Halabja, an Iraqi town of 45,000 that Saddam Hussein attacked 10 years ago with mustard gas and nerve agents sarin, tabun and VX. Thousands of civilians in Halabja died, and thousands more

to this day are incapacitated from that attack. A new generation is being born with birth defects; Halabja is the Hiroshima of chemical weapons. For Saddam Hussein, these are weapons to be used, not weapons of deterrence. His determined effort to conceal them from the U.N. is no game.

Was the president encouraged because Iraq finally let U.N. inspectors into Saddam Hussein's vast "presidential palaces," compounds which he had previously tried to keep off-limits? If so, Clinton had not read inspectors' reports on those visits -- about how the palaces were totally sanitized before the inspections, so that not a document or computer or even stick of furniture remained; about how Iraqi "minders" outnumbered inspectors by as much as five to one, so that at times the inspectors could not work and their motorcades stretched for a kilometer or more; about how Iraqis now insist that return inspec-

tions on a no-notice basis will not be permitted.

Nor can Clinton have listened to his own advisers -- not to State Department spokesman James Rubin, who two weeks ago said Iraqi officials "continue to lie and hide the truth" and, even on the nuclear program, supply "incomplete information in a piecemeal fashion"; nor to Clinton's ambassador to the United Nations, Bill Richardson, who said just last Sunday, "In the area of chemical and biological weapons, we agree with the U.N. inspectors that there's been zero progress."

"Zero progress" -- how can that be encouraging? One White House official was quoted anonymously as saying that Clinton's new tone was designed to keep other nations on board in supporting the inspections regime. France, Russia and China, all U.N. Security Council members, increasingly have wavered in their commitment to let U.N. inspectors

finish their assigned job.

But of course mischaracterizing the extent of Iraqi cooperation only undermines the inspection regime further, rather than bolstering it. If Clinton wants to placate the Chinese, whose U.N. ambassador likened the inspectors to "an army of occupation" running an "insolent and arrogant operation," it won't be difficult.

But he can't do that and also pursue what has been, at least until now, the overriding U.S. policy of ridding an evil dictator of his most deadly weapons.

The worry now is that Clinton has decided that this policy is just too difficult, and so he must adopt an alternate one: fudging the truth. Before he goes down that road, he

should ponder last week's assessment of Saddam Hussein by Britain's U.N. ambassador.

"We are facing a policy of lying on an epic scale that recalls only the policies in that respect of earlier dictators in this century," Sir John Weston said. "While there will always be, as Lenin put it, useful fools who will rush in to embrace

people who pump out this kind of nonsense, I don't think that the U.N.'s general standing in the world is so high right now that it can allow itself to be duped by this kind of thing."

The United States should not play the useful fool for Saddam Hussein.

The writer is a member of the editorial page staff.

Washington Times

INSIDE THE RING

by Ernest Blazar

No respect

It's got to be lonely being the only Republican in a Democratic White House. Few knew just how lonely it has been for Defense Secretary William S. Cohen until last week.

That's when a leaked Pentagon memo showed how the White House has been going behind Mr. Cohen's back on the complicated and politically charged issue of military base closings.

Here's the background: For months, Mr. Cohen has been pitching Congress on the cash-strapped Pentagon's need to shut unneeded military bases. He proposes lawmakers agree to two nonpolitical panels charged with doing just that in 2001 and 2005. But it is a tough sell for the former Maine senator. That is because many members of Congress think the Clinton administration plays dirty when it comes to closing bases.

That's because two Air Force bases — McClellan in Sacramento, Calif., and Kelly in San Antonio — were ordered closed by the 1995 nonpolitical base-closing panel. But instead of shutting them, the White House kept them open by merely "privatizing" the work performed there.

That didn't sit well with lawmakers from other states who wanted their own Air Force bases — under new rules — to compete for and take over Kelly and McClellan's workloads. Together, the bases targeted for closure but saved by the White House, employ 35,000 people (read: voters) and have a combined regional economic impact of \$8 billion (read: happy, paid voters).

So it's been an uphill battle for Mr. Cohen to get Congress to

forgive and forget 1995 and accept more base closings. In speeches and testimony — as a White House representative — he has put his reputation on the line and seemed to be making some headway.

That's why many were shocked when White House fingerprints appeared on a leaked and controversial Pentagon memo last week. It shows how the White House is willing to tinker for political reasons with what is — and should be — the nonpolitical process by which lucrative military bases are kept open or closed. And by extension, it shows the White House's willingness to disrespect its own defense secretary.

In the memo, the acting secretary of the Air Force, who controls the Kelly and McClellan bases, warned John Hamre, Pentagon deputy chief, of the White House's fear of a new threat to one of the bases.

"John Podesta has asked . . ." the Air Force memo begins, referring to President Clinton's special assistant and deputy White House counsel that Mr. Hamre try and convince a private contractor "to bid to win the [McClellan] work and to perform the work in Sacramento."

The White House's problem was another air base — in Utah — might be the sole bidder in a competition for McClellan's work. And if it won, Utah would take the work from California. Confirmed the Air Force memo: "It is Sacramento's uncertainty that is being translated into White House interest."

That kind of political involve-

ment upset lawmakers.

"Up until this memo, many of us thought we were on the right track," Rep. James V. Hansen, Utah Republican, said Thursday. "It blows this whole base closure thing wide open."

He and other lawmakers — spun up beyond normal — charged the White House with more than political wrongdoing. Asking for a formal investigation, they blasted the White House for breaking the law that governs competition between bases. "People have lost their jobs and gone to jail for less than what we are talking about," said Mr. Hansen. Agreed a Senate aide: "I have never seen such an incriminating memo. It goes beyond mere politicization."

At a minimum, the leaked document has set back Mr. Cohen's efforts to build a consensus for more base closings, said Sen. Robert F. Bennett, Utah Republican, who talked about it with the Pentagon chief. "He agreed that with respect to base closings, his task has been made more difficult."

Sen. Paul Coverdell, Georgia Republican, agreed: "They can take all their press releases calling for another [round of base closures] and put them in the nearest wastebasket."

As for the White House's treatment of Mr. Cohen, senators are more understanding. "They know he is in a difficult spot," said one senator's aide. "He was caught totally unawares by this — basically blindsided."

• Ernest Blazar can be reached at 703/486-3949 or via e-mail (blazar@twtmil.com).

Baltimore Sun

May 3, 1998

Pg. 18

U.S. Marine Sentenced For Death In Okinawa

OKINAWA, Japan -- A fifth and final U.S. Marine was sentenced to prison yesterday

for killing a fellow Marine by dropping him out of a third-story barracks window during a drunken thrill-seeking game.

A U.S. military court in Okinawa sentenced Cpl. Geoff Tessier to six years in military prison after convicting him of involuntary manslaughter in the death of Lance Cpl. Christopher Epley. Tessier, from Nashua, N.H., also pleaded guilty to drunk and disorderly behavior.

New York Times

May 3, 1998

Clinton Seeks To Overturn Landmine Moratorium

By Steven Lee Myers

WASHINGTON -- With the Pentagon warning of serious threats to American troops around the world, the administration is scrambling to repeal a law that imposed a moratorium on the use of antipersonnel land mines starting next February.

The law was approved by Congress and signed by President Clinton more than two years ago, long before the worldwide campaign to ban land mines produced an international treaty. The administration refused to sign that treaty last December, but the moratorium has remained on the books.

Although President Clinton signed the moratorium into law in February 1996, his aides have now joined the nation's military commanders, who never supported it in the first place, in campaigning against it, angering the highly organized and vocal critics of land mines.

In a meeting last week, the president's national security adviser, Sandy Berger, appealed to the sponsor of the moratorium, Sen. Patrick Leahy, D-Vt., to push for its reversal.

The moratorium, which sailed through Congress as part of a larger foreign affairs appropriations bill, was meant to prod the Pentagon into searching for alternatives to antipersonnel land mines. It requires the Pentagon to forswear the use of most such mines for only one year, starting Feb. 12, 1999.

In a way, it is a symbolic gesture because the Pentagon has no plans to use any of its 11 million mines as long as the United States is not at war. But to the military commanders, a moratorium could seriously hamper American forces should fighting break out. And with the deadline looming, Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen and other Pentagon officials have stepped up their opposition in public and private appeals to Congress.

In a letter on Friday to Sen. Strom Thurmond, R-S.C., the chairman of the Senate's Committee on Armed Services, Cohen and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Henry Shelton, said they had "grave and substantial concerns" and appealed for the power to waive the moratorium.

The legislation, the letter said, "constitutes an unacceptable risk to our troops and threatens mission accomplishment." It said that if Iraq invaded Kuwait or Saudi Arabia, for example, a moratorium on mines would deny American troops "the means to adequately defend our forces and our allies."

The administration's opposition underscores the extent to which the issue continues to give Clinton political headaches. Although he has expressed support for banning all mines, he has deferred to the military, resisting efforts by some officials in the State Department and National Security Council to move the United States closer to complying with the international treaty.

His aides, who would discuss the issue only on condition of anonymity, said the administration's position on repealing the moratorium evolved after the debate last year over whether the United States should join more than 100 other countries in banning antipersonnel mines.

Moratorium supporters accused Clinton of bowing to what they call the Pentagon's unrealistic concerns. "If the Clinton administration wilts in the face of Pentagon pressure

on the moratorium, their pledge on banning land mines is simply unbelievable," said Mark Perry, associate director of the Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation, which has led the campaign against mines.

In the last two years, Republican opponents of the moratorium in the House have introduced legislation to reverse it in the Defense Department's authorization bill. Each time, the Senate has refused to take it up.

While the moratorium still permits mines along international borders or demilitarized zones, a report Cohen submitted to Congress at the end of March said it would prevent the use of nearly two-thirds of the nation's stockpile. In particular, the Pentagon fears any restrictions on the use of "mixed systems." These use antipersonnel mines to shield antitank mines, which are not covered by the international treaty.

Washington Post

May 3, 1998

Pg. 25

Gore Visits U.S. Unit In Saudi Desert

Crown Prince Remains Unmoved on Aiding Probe of Fatal '96 Bombing in Dhahran

By Thomas W. Lippman
Washington Post
Staff Writer

PRINCE SULTAN AIR BASE, Saudi Arabia, May 2— Vice President Gore, friend of Israel yesterday, Vietnam veteran today, paid tribute to the U.S. troops at this sunbaked desert outpost, hailing them as a "light, lean and lethal" force for peace and stability in this part of the world.

Recalling his own service as an enlisted man in the U.S. Army -- "I rose to the exalted rank of E-5" -- Gore joked, bantered and ate a quick meal with the men and women who form the bulwark of U.S. air power in the region.

"I wanted to come and meet the best of the best," he said to the cheers of troops gathered in an air-conditioned tent.

Gore said he understands the hardships of serving at such a remote site in forbidding terrain, with no off-base privileges and few contacts with the outside world.

Left unsaid was the reason

the troops are in this hostile environment: The operation was transferred here from the Eastern Province after a terrorist attack nearly two years ago. That crime is unsolved and apparently will remain so, at least from Washington's point of view.

U.S. officials have made no secret of their frustration at their inability to track down the perpetrators of the June 1996 truck-bomb attack that killed 19 U.S. airmen in Dhahran. FBI Director Louis Freeh and other officials have complained publicly about the lack of cooperation by Saudi authorities, who have refused to allow U.S. investigators to question suspects detained in the case.

But it has been clear for months that from the U.S. perspective, the case is all but dormant. In September, U.S. officials dropped charges against a Saudi man believed to have knowledge of the bombing because, according to Freeh, Saudi authorities failed to provide evidence against him that could be used in a U.S. court.

At a meeting in Quantico, Va., in December with relatives of the victims, Freeh told reporters, "we did not report to them great progress. We did not report to them the imminence of an indictment or charges. We said we were frustrated with certain aspects of the case."

That frustration continues, senior officials said, and there have been no new developments.

"We need to get to the bottom of this," one senior official said. "As our friends we would expect the Saudis to help, if they have the opportunity. Our message is, 'If [they] ever learn anything, we could use their help.'"

But the Saudis, already under political pressure because of the U.S. troop presence here, have shown no indication that they are prepared to allow U.S. investigators into the case. In a five-hour meeting last night, Gore and Crown Prince Abdullah had what a senior official described as "a long and penetrating discussion of the origins of terror and its consequences,"

but there was no indication of a change in the Saudi position.

U.S. officials have virtually stopped discussing the bombing in public, except when asked. It occurred a year before the surprise election of Mohammed Khatemi as Iran's president, an event that has substantially altered the atmos-

pherics between Washington and Tehran.

U.S. law enforcement and intelligence officials have long suspected that Iran organized the 1996 truck-bomb attack, and Iran was named in a State Department report last week as "the most active sponsor of state terrorism" in 1997.

Khatemi has taken modest

but significant steps signaling a willingness to tone down the hostility, and the Clinton administration has reciprocated. Part of the administration's new approach has been to mute its public criticism of Iran, and to differentiate acts that occurred before Khatemi's election from what has happened since.

Gore and Abdullah dis-

cussed developments in Iran at length, a senior official said. They agreed that while Khatemi's initiatives have been welcome, "on their external behavior, the state support of terrorism, and acquisition of weapons of mass destruction, we don't see a change," the official said.

Washington Times

May 3, 1998

Pg. 3

Cohen not bothered by China's missiles

By Joyce Howard Price
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Plenty of ability to retaliate, he says

Defense Secretary William S. Cohen says it's "not a major concern to me" if China has 13 long-range strategic missiles aimed at the United States, because he sees U.S. nuclear capacity as a "very strong deterrent" to possible attacks.

"We have a very substantial deterrent as far as our own nuclear capability that no nation should ever be under the assumption that they would ... feel free to attack the United States," Mr. Cohen said yesterday on CNN's "Evans & Novak."

"I think the Chinese, the Russians, anyone else is well aware of that, so it is not a major concern to me."

The defense secretary's comments came in response to questions about a story in Friday's editions of The Washington Times about a new CIA document that indicates 13 of China's 18 CSS-4 missiles — with a range of more than 8,000 miles and single nuclear warheads — are trained on U.S. cities.

Mr. Cohen declined to comment on the accuracy of the report. "I don't comment on either intelligence reports or anything else that would pertain to that type of report. I would say that we have a very good working relationship with the Chinese at this point," he said.

"We're always concerned about missile technology proliferation, and we are working very closely with the Chinese to cut down the proliferation of missile technology. We will continue to work with them in terms of a better relationship with them."

Later, Mr. Cohen acknowledged the United States "at this point" does not have a strategic relationship with China. But "it's been progressing in recent years," he said.

In the wide-ranging CNN interview, Mr. Cohen also said that "in the next few weeks" he hopes to present proposals to President

Clinton for a possible downsizing of U.S. troops in the Persian Gulf.

"It would be my hope that sometime in the foreseeable future that we might be able to readjust the level of forces that we have there but maintain a very vigorous presence, nevertheless, in the region that could be augmented at any time," he said.

Earlier this year, the United States was poised to launch air strikes against Iraq because of Saddam Hussein's refusal to allow U.N. weapons inspectors into all sites they wanted to inspect. That threat was defused by an agreement U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan reached with Saddam that opened up eight presidential sites previously off-limits.

Co-host Robert Novak asked when U.S. troops in the Gulf will be coming home, given they were "sent out ... for a war that didn't happen."

"That remains to be determined. We're now examining the situation in Iraq," said Mr. Cohen.

He pointed out that it was because Saddam "threatened to shoot down our U-2 aircraft and threatened our forces in the region" that U.S. deployment in the Gulf was increased "from 15,000

or 20,000 troops to about 37,000 troops."

The CIA report disclosing that Chinese long-range strategic missiles are targeted at U.S. cities was sent to U.S. policy-makers two weeks ago in advance of Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright's current visit to Beijing.

Mr. Cohen insisted yesterday that the new report, even if true, does not contradict Mr. Clinton's October 1996 statement: "There is not a single solitary nuclear missile pointed at an American child tonight. Not one. Not one. Not a single one."

The president's statement was "true at that time and may still be true today," the defense secretary said.

Mr. Cohen was also asked about an April 26 memo from acting Air Force Secretary F. Whitten Peters in which he talks about "White House interests" in keeping open McClellan Air Force Base in California, a state that's vital to the president's political interests. Rep. Tillie Fowler, Florida Republican, says she sees this as the end of military base closings.

Asked to respond, Mr. Cohen replied: "The White House may have some interest in seeing to it that there's a fair competition. But that's all that the White House is going to ask for or receive."

Washington Times

May 4, 1998

Pg. 6

Inside Politics

Compiled by Greg Pierce

You, too

Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen does not think it would be a good idea to have the president and officials such as Mr. Cohen adhere to the Uniform Code of Military Conduct, which, among other things, prohibits adultery.

A House subcommittee approved such a measure last week.

"I think it's unnecessary, to say the least. But I don't have any difficulty with it as far as I'm con-

cerned," Mr. Cohen said Saturday on CNN's "Evans & Novak."

"I don't see the purpose of it," he added. "Frankly, we are civilians, and we have civilian control of the military as such in a democratic society. If members of Congress feel that we should all be under the Uniform Code of Military Justice, it seems to me that that ought to apply on a much broader scale."

That might include members of Congress who "pass judgment on military appropriations, or perhaps authorizations," Mr. Cohen suggested.

Air Force Memo Inflames Debate Over Politics In Base Closings

Washington Post

May 3, 1998

Pg. 9

By Bradley Graham
Washington Post
Staff Writer

An Air Force memo portraying the White House as pressing to save jobs at a California air base slated for closure has renewed accusations in Congress of political meddling in the base closing process.

The April 26 memo, which surfaced on Capitol Hill late last week, cited John D. Podesta, the White House deputy chief of staff, as requesting that a top Pentagon official encourage Bethesda's Lockheed Martin Corp. to go after some of the maintenance business at the air base and keep the work in Sacramento.

Podesta and other senior officials involved in the matter denied they had tried to apply inappropriate influence. They said they simply were attempting to save taxpayer money by ensuring a vigorous competition for the work at McClellan Air Force Base.

But lawmakers who have led a fight against privatizing depot work decried the memo as fresh evidence that administration officials were seeking still to make good on a promise President Clinton made just before the 1996 elections that many of the 8,700 jobs at McClellan would be preserved.

That move, widely denounced by legislators at the time as a transparent effort to curry favor in vote-rich Cali-

fornia, has clouded the base closing process since.

In 1995 an independent commission recommended shutting McClellan and shifting the maintenance business to another military depot in the interest of achieving greater efficiency through consolidation. Instead, Clinton directed that private firms be allowed to assume some of the work on site.

Clinton's action created so much political resentment -- particularly among lawmakers in states such as Utah, Oklahoma and Georgia with depots that stand to inherit business from McClellan -- that Congress has rejected new appeals by Defense Secretary William S. Cohen for additional shutdowns to pay for military modernization plans.

The Pentagon has sought to allay concerns on Capitol Hill by dropping any requirement that McClellan's business be kept in place and by holding open competitions among military depots and private firms for the work.

But disclosure of the Air Force memo appears to have undercut whatever progress Cohen and his aides were making toward congressional approval for more base closures.

"With this new evidence, as far as I'm concerned, any attempts for additional rounds of base closure with this administration are dead on arrival," Rep. C. Saxby Chambliss (R-

Ga.) said in a statement.

"This is the smoking gun," declared Rep. James V. Hansen (R-Utah), whose office released the memo. "The White House and the Pentagon have no interest in a fair competition but only in the appearance of one set up to produce a political result."

Hansen said he had requested a full hearing on the McClellan case before the National Security Committee, including a review of all communications on the subject between the White House and the Pentagon.

The two-page memo was from acting Air Force Secretary F. Whitten Peters to Deputy Defense Sec John J. Hamre. It followed an administration meeting about the McClellan case and recounted points that Peters said Podesta wanted Hamre to raise at a later meeting with Lockheed Martin's chief executive officer, Vance Coffman.

"The points he would like you to make are to encourage Lockheed Martin (1) to bid to win the work and (2) to perform the work at Sacramento," Peters wrote.

Peters included a history of Lockheed Martin's involvement, reporting that the company had been considering making such a bid but the Sacramento community was worried the company might drop out.

He said Lockheed Martin was looking either at doing the

work in Sacramento or moving it to Greenville, S.C., where the firm has an aircraft repair facility.

"It is Sacramento's uncertainty that is being translated into White House interest," Peters stated.

The only certain bidder at the moment appears to be the military depot at Hill Air Force Base in Utah, which plans to team with the Boeing Co. and relocate McClellan's business. The work includes maintenance of KC-135 aircraft and repair of hydraulic, electrical and electronic systems.

"There was nothing inappropriate in the suggestion from the White House that we encourage a strong competition," Hamre wrote to several lawmakers Friday. "We are under no instructions from the White House to do anything other than hold a fair and rigorous competition."

He insisted that "nothing has changed" in how the Defense Department intends to conduct the competition, meaning there will be no requirement for Lockheed Martin or any other potential bidder to preserve jobs in Sacramento.

Podesta, through a spokesman, denied having requested that Hamre encourage Lockheed Martin to keep the work in Sacramento. He said the memo had been mistaken on this point. And Hamre was reported never to have raised the McClellan situation in his meeting with Coffman.

Air Force's Top General Proposes 'Superbases'

Baltimore Sun

May 3, 1998

Pg. 5

Plan involves closing some fields, paring others

Associated Press

WASHINGTON -- The Air Force's top general wants to create a handful of "superbases" in the United States by bolstering some and paring or closing others.

"This is an urgent issue," Gen. Michael Ryan said in an interview. "We need to reorganize ourselves. We need to get rid of excess infrastructure."

The pressure in recent years of establishing bases at over-

seas crisis points -- Bosnia, the Middle East, Africa -- has resulted in domestic bases being "stretched too thin," Ryan said.

And while Air Force combat units are designed to deploy at a moment's notice, the cooks, engineers, medical personnel, military police and other units that keep bases humming aren't organized for immediate assignment abroad.

So the general is looking at consolidating such support units at four to six bases in the United States. He would not

specify them, saying that he has asked his staff for a "template" of which bases should grow and which should be slimmed or shut down.

He also is considering organizing combat units into "expeditionary" forces to rotate responsibility for overseas deployments, allowing personnel to count on time at home with their families, he said.

But he stressed that the Air Force needs to close bases, and that is a suggestion that sends chills through communities

across the nation and has been rejected by many lawmakers on Capitol Hill. The service has 67 major bases in the United States and 14 abroad.

"This isn't easy, but it's necessary," Ryan said.

In the aftermath of the Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia in 1996 that claimed 19 airmen, bases at home and abroad are creating special security teams to counter possible terrorist threats. Bigger bases would make that process easier.

"We are spread so thin

across our bases that when you take a 44-man security force team off the base, it's a big whack out of the security force on the base, and everybody starts working twice as hard," Ryan said. Such Air Force units both at home and abroad work 12-hour shifts.

The general lauded the Navy and the Marine Corps for consolidating support units at a few bases, moves made in base closure rounds in 1993 and 1995. Those services "have it about right," Ryan said. "When they leave a port, they do not strip their support out of the home bases to put it on the ships.

"We've been doing this for eight years now, and it is really

wearing on the force," he said.

In the past, the Air Force was designed to be much bigger and structured to "surge" its forces forward into battle against the enemy -- relying to a great extent on allied bases with supplies ready to offer to arriving combat units.

The post-Cold War draw-down is responsible for some of the manpower problem. Over the past 10 years, the service has plummeted from 607,000 members to 371,000 men and women this year -- a cut of about 40 percent. But since the base closure process began in 1988, 17 Air Force bases have been closed and 16 realigned, a cut estimated by

the Air Force of about 21 percent.

The general's "superbase" proposal dovetails with that of Defense Secretary William S. Cohen, who has been pressing Congress for two additional rounds of base closures -- and getting the cold shoulder in return.

Cohen argues the military must cut back on bases to keep troops ready to go to war and to glean long-term savings for updating weaponry for the next century.

Last week on Capitol Hill, the secretary warned that closures will not result in "a reduction in the quality of life of our men and women in uniform, a reduction in the readi-

ness of our forces or a cutback rather significantly in our procurement plans."

Gen. Michael Dugan, a Ryan predecessor as Air Force chief of staff, said Ryan's move to close bases is imperative.

"We are not getting the bang for our buck," Dugan said.

Dan Kuehl, an air-power expert at the National Defense University in Washington, warned that such centralization of troops also increases their vulnerability. Kuehl, who worked on a study of the Air Force and the gulf war, noted that much of the service's support equipment "was stressed to the max" during that endeavor, when it was much larger.

Los Angeles Times

May 3, 1998

Pg. 1

Pilot Defends Acts In Italian Air Tragedy

MILITARY: Southland native believes he'll be cleared in ski gondola fall that left 20 dead.

By Richard A. Serrano
Times Staff Writer

ATLANTIC BEACH, N.C. -- Marine Corps Capt. Richard Ashby remembers the two cables just suddenly appearing in midair.

Strapped into the cockpit of his EA-6B Prowler jet, he banked the wing, rolled hard to the left and dropped the nose, but even those maneuvers were not enough to avoid the impact. He heard a light thud as one wing and the upper part of the tail hit something and then, pulling the plane up, he again saw blue sky.

Uncertain of what had happened, concerned about damage to his plane, fearful for the safety of his crew, he hurried home to Aviano Air Base in Italy.

He thought he was returning a hero, his crew safe, his plane intact. Instead, he quickly heard the news that forever changed the destiny of this decorated pilot who as a young boy rode his bicycle to the strawberry fields of Orange County and dreamed of flying the military jets roaring in and out of nearby El Toro Marine Corps Air Station.

The wires were part of an aerial gondola system at a popular ski resort in the northern Italian mountains, his supervisors told him. The jet's

shearing of the cables three months ago today sent 20 civilians in a cable car hurtling to their deaths, strained the relations of NATO allies and bolstered demands that the U.S. military get out of Europe.

The Marine Corps, reacting quickly to the public outcry, preliminarily determined the mishap was due to "air crew error"--that Ashby was flying too low, too fast and too recklessly during a routine NATO training mission.

But in his first interview since the Feb. 3 crash, the 31-year-old pilot maintained he was cleared to fly low and at high speeds, and that his military-approved flight maps never indicated there were any ski resorts or other populated areas along the routine training run dubbed "Easy 01."

Facing court-martial and potentially the rest of his life in prison, Ashby believes he will be vindicated.

"I have a lot of faith and I have it in my heart and I have it in my head," he said.

With these words, he touched his chest. He patted his forehead. And then his turquoise eyes filled with tears as he recalled those who died and the families that have suffered.

During the day, while on the job, he replays in his mind those frantic seconds, he said. Then he comes home at night to his condo, a single man

alone with his unforgiving thoughts, the pounding Atlantic surf just outside his bedroom window. Italy is an ocean away, and he falls asleep exhausted, unable to bring back a score of innocent lives.

"I have faith in God and I have faith in the Marine Corps," he said. "If it was not for that faith, then I could not get through this. Faith is what keeps me going."

In the aftermath of the tragedy, he and his three crew members were sent home to the Outer Banks of North Carolina. At work, he handles inconsequential duties at the nearby Marine bases at Cherry Point and Camp Lejeune and prepares for the start of military legal proceedings on multiple counts of negligent homicide and reckless endangerment.

In an 80-page investigative report, Ashby's supervisors determined that he bears the lion's share of blame. "The pilot is ultimately responsible for the safe planning and execution of the flight," the report concludes.

According to the investigators, Ashby's plane hit one cable at 370 feet, the other one at 364 feet--both well below where the jet should have been.

"The entire low-level portion of the mishap flight was planned and briefed at an altitude of 1,000 feet," the report says. "However, most of the

low-level portion of the flight should have been planned, briefed and flown at 2,000 feet."

Ashby, however, said it was common to fly even lower than those altitudes on Prowler training missions, particularly on those where flight maps show no populated areas nearby. He said the aircraft is used to provide cover for bombers and is most efficient when hugging the ground.

"We briefed on what we believed to be the proper altitude and we never intentionally went under 500 feet," he said.

"And you can't always maintain 1,000 feet. You're in a turn, and you could descend. You're in another maneuver, and you could climb. But if we ever thought we weren't flying safely or were at risk, we never would have done that."

He said he was never told about the ski area. Inside his bedroom desk he keeps a copy of the flight map, which, although it highlights aerial ski trams in sections of nearby Switzerland, makes no mention of similar resorts in Italy's Dolomite Mountains.

"If we had known it was there, we never would have hit it," he said.

But the report notes that three separate copies of low-level military warning cards were found in the cockpit. One warned that "Minimum altitude

over snow-covered mountainous terrain is 1,000 feet." Another advised "the flight should be flown at 2,000 feet."

Ashby assumes the other crew members must have brought the cards aboard. "As the pilot, I don't bring anything with me," he said. "But other people may bring things in their bags they don't even know are there."

The report also concluded that Ashby "exceeded the maximum airspeed by 100 nautical miles per hour."

On this point, he declined to detail what his defense will be when his legal proceedings begin next month.

"They're trying to portray me as a cowboy, and that's hogwash," he said. "They were starting to call me Rambo, and saying that we were trying to fly under the wire. They said we were even betting beers. . . .

"But to me, flying is an art form. It's not just, hey, move left or move right. It's an art form, and if you don't practice it, you're going to lose it. You're not going to be that good."

He said he knows that, at least for the Marines and likely for any commercial airline as well, he will never fly again. "For the military, probably not," he said. "There's too much political pressure now, even if I'm acquitted. They're saying I could get something like 400-plus years, and I can't even imagine me ever being in prison."

The tragedy touched off a

firestorm in international relations. Italian officials cried out for swift and harsh punishment, at one point demanding that the four crew members be turned over to their country's courts. Some Italian leaders renewed their clamor for the United States to remove its military bases from Italy.

But U.S. officials invoked NATO rules stating that whenever a mishap occurs, the responsible NATO member—in this case, the United States—should deal with the problem internally.

And the United States did act fast. Clinton administration officials immediately apologized to the Italians and those families who lost loved ones, pledging to pay reparations. And within a month, the Marines had completed their investigative findings and sent the case well on its way to a court-martial.

Capt. William L. Raney II, 26, of Englewood, Colo., and Capt. Chandler P. Seagraves, 28, of Nineveh, Ind., who sat in the back seats of the plane and operated its electronic jamming gear, have been ordered to a hearing beginning Tuesday. The session is similar to a preliminary hearing in civilian courts to determine whether the charges of negligent homicide and reckless endangerment should go to trial.

Ashby and his co-pilot, Capt. Joseph P. Schweitzer, 30, of Westbury, N.Y., are scheduled for a similar session to start June 15.

"It was the worst nightmare come true," said Ashby, recalling the disbelief he and his crew shared on hearing the news upon their safe return to Aviano. "I couldn't even believe it. We were all shaken up in the first place. But once we found out what had happened, it just made it that much worse."

His eyes watered up again. "I wish it never would have happened," he said. "I'm sorry. Something like this. . . . It was. . .

The way we look at it, the way I look at it, it was an accident. Nothing was done intentionally. I feel for all the victims. I think about that all the time, especially when I read who these people were to other people."

He recalled how his own father died in a traffic accident driving home from Santa Ana to the family's house in Mission Viejo. Ashby was 20 years old then, and it was around the time he had decided to join the Marine Corps.

"I know what it's like to lose someone without any notice," he said. "I know how they feel."

The night after the tragedy, he sent an e-mail message to his mother, Carol Anderson, who teaches a computer lab at the El Toro base school for the children of military families.

"We did nothing wrong," he wrote.

And he told her: "I need your prayers. I'm worried that they are going to make us the scapegoats because it is an in-

ternational incident. I've been poked and prodded by the U.S. and Italians all day. Haven't eaten or slept."

Soon afterward, he received a message from a man he knows only as "Mr. Strzelczyk," a Polish citizen who lost his wife and 14-year-old son in the cable car.

"This is a tragic accident—a tragedy of life," the man wrote.

He said he and his family "hold no ill will against the pilots and the pilots are in our prayers."

The man added that his brother is a priest, and that he had asked his brother "to remember the pilots in his prayers."

"It's that kind of stuff," said Ashby, "that makes us survive this, really."

"Because we'll fight this until we are acquitted, and then some. One thing the Marine Corps has taught me is how to fight and not to give up. And I still love the Marine Corps."

Tears well up once more. "I'll always love the Marine Corps for what it stands for. It doesn't matter."

"Because, you know, we used to ride our bikes in the hills on the departure end at El Toro and watch the jets go by. I'd go to all the air shows at El Toro. I remember being a very young age and my father holding me on his shoulders and the planes flying right out over our heads."

"I just thought that was one of the neatest things in the world. I just thought it was great."

Marines invading Chicago to study waging war in big-city combat zones

Washington Times

May 3, 1998

Pg. 3

ASSOCIATED PRESS

Eighty camouflage-dressed Marines are planning an invasion of Chicago this week — not to fight but to start learning how to wage war in an area cluttered with skyscrapers, sewers, rail tunnels and lots of people.

It's part of a two-year experiment in big-city warfare to prepare the Marines for some of the dangers of the new century.

"Our tactics, doctrine and technology have not kept up with urbanization," Gen. Charles C. Krulak, the Corps' commandant, told

the Armed Forces Journal. "In future conflicts, our enemies will lure us into the cities in an attempt to mitigate our capabilities and make us fight where we are the least effective."

The program, begun last summer, has included training in a four-block model town at Camp Lejeune, N.C., and envisions later practice war games in Charleston, S.C., and Jacksonville, Fla. It is to culminate in a mock battle fought on the streets of an as-yet-unidentified West Coast city.

The Chicago phase does not

promise to be too action-packed.

Officers from Camp Lejeune's 1st Battalion, 8th Marines; from the Corp's Quantico, Va.-based Warfighting Laboratory and from the Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Force (Experimental) will get a 2½-day lesson in what makes a city tick.

They'll tour a gas company, water filtration plant, some bridges, underground tunnels, the police and fire departments and other sites, said Lt. Col. Jenny Holbert, a spokeswoman for the 3-

year-old warfighting lab.

Chicago was chosen largely because it has most of the features typical of the complicated, large cities where U.S. forces someday may find themselves fighting: a river, shore access, subways, even a drawbridge.

Cities are considered likely scenes of future strife because 70 percent of the world's population will live in urban areas by 2020 and

because they tend to have such classic ingredients of conflict as poverty and cultural, religious and social tensions.

Gen. Krulak established the war-fighting lab in 1995, and it has a budget of \$32.5 million this year. The Marines want to learn how to maneuver around city infrastructure, communicate while in close quarters with an enemy, minimize

the effects of fighting on civilians and care for casualties when medical facilities may be offshore.

In return for Chicago's playing host, the Pentagon will share some of its communications and other technologies that could help during a civilian disaster such as a major storm or water-supply cut-off.

European Star & Stripes

May 2, 1998

Pg. 1

Navy's Where New Action Is

Sea power answers threats of new era

By Jon R. Anderson
Staff writer

WASHINGTON — Top leaders are looking to the Navy to help lead the U.S. European Command out of the Cold War and its Soviet-era strategies and into the 21st century. Had the Cold War turned into a hot fight in Europe, you might say the Navy was the military equivalent of a baseball outfielder — definitely needed, but nowhere near the real action.

The Army and Air Force trained together to hold the infamous Fulda Gap — the most vulnerable point in Germany — against the Soviet threat while the Navy watched from a distance, mostly in a supporting role.

But as NATO and U.S. forces in Europe shift their focus away from the all-but-faded threat in the east to more pressing and diverse concerns in the south, the Navy has found itself moved into the infield.

"When you look at where all the action for Europe has been recently," said one top European Command staff officer, "it's been in the south and mostly along the coasts of the Mediterranean, the Adriatic and Aegean, as well as down off of Africa."

"And when you look at where our potential flashpoints could be — Algeria for example — most of them will involve the sea services," he said.

Among the threats top leaders are concerned about:

****North Africa —** Algeria is being bathed in blood daily as Islamic revolutionaries attack villages and natural gas

pipelines throughout the country. Libya remains a concern as well, still suspected of promoting international terrorism and producing weapons of mass destruction.

****Greece and Turkey —** The rift between these two countries — both NATO allies — is great. They maintain a long-standing dispute over a chain of islands off Turkey's coast. The face-off remains a threat to the NATO alliance itself, and many U.S. intelligence analysts say the situation could explode at any time.

****Cyprus —** Turkish troops occupied the northern part of this island-state in 1974 with the stated goal of protecting ethnic Turks during a Greek Cypriot military coup. The island remains divided between ethnic Turks in the north and ethnic Greeks in the south. Cyprus has announced it will field a new anti-aircraft missile this summer capable of hitting Turkish warplanes, prompting fierce rhetoric from Turkey that it will take "all necessary action" to remove them.

****The Balkans —** While a relative peace has settled in Bosnia, neighboring Kosovo brims with violence as the ethnic Albanian majority demands independence from the Republic of Yugoslavia. Fighting could easily spread into neighboring Macedonia and Albania, igniting the whole region in war.

****The Middle East —** Perhaps the biggest threat to world stability is the multifaceted problems of the Middle East. Iraq and Iran remain sore points in the Persian Gulf, but closer to Europe, continuing

problems

with the peace process in Israel remain far from resolved.

The U.S. shift in focus from the north to the south of the Alps was underscored recently when an admiral was promoted to the second highest post in Europe, forgoing an unwritten rule that said the job belonged to either the Air Force or the Army. Vice Adm. Charles "Steve" Abbot, currently commander of the Navy's Sixth Fleet, was nominated by President Clinton on April 15 to pin on a fourth star and become the deputy commander in chief of the U.S. European Command, which oversees all U.S. forces in Europe, plus much of Africa and the Mediterranean countries of the Middle East.

Assuming the nomination is approved by the Senate, Abbot will replace Air Force Gen. James L. Jamerson.

Abbot's nomination for the job is designed "to signal a sea change from the central-front-axis mentality to the broader threats and challenges facing NATO to the south," said a senior Pentagon official.

"NATO has made the intellectual decision to turn south. Our forces ought to be doing the same thing," said Gen. John J. Sheehan, who headed up the U.S. Atlantic Command and NATO's Atlantic regions before retiring last year. "Steve Abbot is a good pick to help make that happen."

Pentagon spokesman Ken Bacon said Abbot's nomination was based both on his joint and 6th Fleet experience, "as well as to signal a change in focus in that region towards NATO's southern flank and the eastern Med."

Abbot brings with him the salt water savvy of an aircraft carrier commander and naval aviator. But he's no stranger to top-level staffs or the European

Command. In fact, before taking over Sixth Fleet, Abbot held the No. 4 post in Europe as the command's director of operations. During that time he helped manage everything from the crises in Albania, when a failed pyramid scheme plummeted that country into chaos last year, to the ongoing rift between Turkey and Greece.

Abbot also is expected to play a key role in guiding the European Command while it expands its area of responsibility to include countries around the Black Sea this year. Beginning Oct. 1, military relations with Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova, Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan will all fall under the command's responsibility. This responsibility includes activities that range from fostering closer military ties to developing war plans should relations turn sour.

Most recently he oversaw the Marine Corps' first significant participation in peacekeeping operations in Bosnia when Sixth Fleet landed a Marine Expeditionary Force for exercises there in March.

New York Times
May 4, 1998

Lightning Bolt Kills National Guardsman At Fort Dix

By David Rohde

A bolt of lightning that struck during a relatively mild storm killed a 22-year-old New Jersey National Guardsman and burned five other reservists, two of them critically, during a routine training exercise in the sprawling pinelands of the Fort

Dix military base in central New Jersey early Sunday morning, officials said.

The lightning struck a pine tree a few feet from three 10-foot-tall tents at 5:15 a.m. as more than two dozen soldiers from a National Guard artillery unit based in Lawrenceville, N.J., slept.

Lt. Col. John Dwyer, a New Jersey National Guard spokesman, said investigators believe the lightning traveled down the tree, through the ground and into the nine-person tents.

"I've seen units that were struck by lightning before," Dwyer said. "But I've never seen a fatality."

Specialist Kenyon Hodges, 22, of Trenton, was pronounced dead on arrival at Community Medical Center in

Toms River early Sunday morning. Helicopters carried three badly burned members of his unit, Specialist Matthew Scheper, 23, Pfc. Jose Santiago, 34, and Pvt. Barry Johnson, 37, to Saint Barnabas Medical Center in Livingston, N.J.

Base officials said Johnson and Santiago, both of Trenton, were in critical but stable condition on Sunday night and Scheper, of Somerset, was in serious but stable condition.

Three other reservists, Pfc. Adolphus Hayes, 23, of Trenton, Sgt. Keith Goslin, 28, of Lawrenceville and Pfc. Eric Fekete -- who cut himself while trying to aid those hurt -- suffered minor injuries and were treated at Ocean County hospitals and released. Fekete's age

and hometown were not available.

National Weather Service meteorologists based in nearby Mount Holly said the bolt emerged from a small, spectacular thunderstorm that formed over Burlington County and moved northeast over the Fort Dix area on Sunday morning between 5 and 5:30 a.m.

Instruments recorded roughly one lightning strike per minute during the period, a relatively small number. "It wasn't an extraordinary amount of lightning," a meteorologist, Al Cope, said. "But it only takes one."

Carolee Nisbet, a Fort Dix spokeswoman, said the unit, Bravo Battery of the Third

Battalion, 112th Field Artillery, was camped near Route 70 in an area of scattered pines on the southern edge of the 50-square-mile base.

Dwyer said the unit, which operates self-propelled 155-millimeter howitzers, followed proper procedure and did not camp in the open or near a single tall tree, which could attract lightning. If a thunderstorm approaches, soldiers are instructed not to set up radios or stand on armored vehicles.

"There was relatively nothing the unit should have done differently," Dwyer said.

Roughly 7,400 reservists from 50 units from across the Northeast were on the base over the weekend for routine monthly training exercises.

New York Daily News May 3, 1998 Pg. 28

Ad Blitz Hawks Pricey Raptor

By Richard Sisk
Daily News
Washington Bureau

WASHINGTON -- As the inspirational music rises in the background, the breathy voice of the woman narrator intones, "Someday in the future, someone you love may be depending on the F-22."

The radio ad is just one in an evocative series churned out by Lockheed Martin saturating the local all-news station in a bid to help the F-22 Raptor program fly through budget turbulence in Congress this week.

In another ad for the new Air Force fighter, the actor affects the golly-gosh voice of

a young G.I. on a future battlefield, telling the folks back home not to worry because, "We've got everything going for us on the ground, and the F-22s have scared away every plane for 200 miles."

In newspaper and magazine ads, Lockheed Martin bills the F-22 as "The Anti-War Plane" — so intimidating that enemies would choose not to fight.

But the staggering price of the F-22 and delays in its production have been intimidating bean counters at the General Accounting Office.

Even some of the plane's strongest supporters have gasped at a projected \$192 million price tag on each Raptor.

The F-22 is meant to replace aging F-15 Eagles and F-16 Fighting Falcons of the Air Force in the next century.

When combined with the costs of the upgraded versions of the F-18 Hornet for the Navy and Marine Corps, and the Joint Strike Fighter for all the services, the total bill for tactical aircraft is put at a colossal \$350 billion — the largest military procurement program in history.

Critics of the program question the need for the futuristic planes when the current crop of U.S. fighters is unchallenged in the skies.

"We're literally in an arms race with ourselves," said retired Rear Adm. Eugene Carroll, a combat pilot in Korea and Vietnam and now deputy director of the Center for Defense Information.

But retired Air Force Lt. Gen. Thomas McInerney, head of Business Executives for National Security, said, "We've got a problem with aging air-

craft."

Problems with the F-22 stem in part from its revolutionary design, blending radar-evading stealth technology for the first time in a highly maneuverable aircraft equipped with "Supercruise" — the ability to fly faster than the speed of sound without using afterburners.

But the plane's design problems largely are offset by its political pluses. Its final assembly is at the Lockheed Martin plant in Marietta, Ga., hometown of House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.). The plane also would involve more than 3,000 subcontractors in 43 states and is expected to produce 27,000 jobs.

The House and Senate are set to take first steps this week in approving \$2.4 billion for F-22 production this year.

Time

May 11, 1998

Pg. 38

A Popular Bad Idea

Expanding NATO comes with risks as well as costs

By Bruce W. Nelan

What has NATO done for us lately? Serbs are slaughtering ethnic Albanians in Kosovo while the alliance shrugs off American demands to get tough with Belgrade. When

Albania collapsed into chaos and automatic gunfire last year, NATO managed to do precisely nothing. In Bosnia the European allies dithered for years until the U.S. insisted on bombing the Serbs. But in Washington last week, where the Senate voted to bring three new members into NATO, supporters attributed magical qualities to the alliance, including the power to make the whole Continent peaceful and prosperous. Bill Clinton said the inclusion of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland

began the fulfillment of "the dream of a generation, a Europe that is united, democratic and secure."

Amid such soaring rhetoric, it was hard to recall just what NATO is: a military alliance. It is about the commitment and deployment of armed forces. The Clinton Administration has done its best to portray it as something else—a political association devoted to institution building. But the Czechs, Hungarians and Poles knew they were applying to an alliance

created to oppose Russia, and that's why they wanted to get in. Bill Clinton may think there is a new NATO, but the Central Europeans admit privately that they are joining the old one.

Now that expansion is happening, what does it do? The first issue it raises is credibility. Advocates of NATO expansion agree that the Central and East European states face no military threat; so to them, the whole thing looks risk-free. But if in a few years Poland gets into a scrape with Ukraine, say,

or Hungary with Romania, would the U.S. be willing to send American forces or nuclear weapons to defend the new allies? Such spats will never happen, say the proponents.

One inevitable result is a conventional arms race. The three new members are going to spend huge amounts on modernizing their militaries--a prospect that pleases U.S. weapons dealers and Congress.

To get in on an expected arms-sales bonanza, the Senate last week voted down an amendment that would have capped U.S. subsidies for such weapons purchases. Hungary, for example, intends to spend almost \$1 billion on new jet fighters. Can Poland be far behind? These countries don't need top-of-the-line warplanes and tanks, but the hardware is part of a plan to achieve "interoperability" with the

Western allies. Ukraine, Russia and other states left outside NATO will be sure to react.

In the next stage of expansion, the candidates will include Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, three former Soviet republics that border Russia itself. Russian officials from Boris Yeltsin on down swear they absolutely, positively will not tolerate Baltic membership in the Atlantic alliance. This stage, two or three years from

now, could mean a return to some form of East-West cold war. And since nuclear weapons are the only way NATO could defend the Baltic states against a threat from Russia, it could also mean a return to the terrible days when thermonuclear missile forces confronted each other across European borders. The dream of a generation could turn out to be a recurring nightmare, and the Senate voted for it, 80 to 19.

New York Newsday

May 1, 1998

Flawed Army Trucks

Costly New Vehicles Found To Roll Over At Intended Speeds

By Patrick J. Sloyan
Washington Bureau

Washington -- The first batch of the Army's newest trucks has been involved in a series of rollovers that have resulted in load restrictions and sharply reduced speed limits, according to Army safety alerts.

At least 12 rollovers have forced Army officials to restrict most of the trucks, estimated to cost \$100,000 apiece, to speeds of no more than 30 mph on surfaced roads and 12 mph on sharp turns, documents show.

The trucks were designed to carry troops and heavy loads while speeding at 55 mph and zig-zagging over battlefields. They were to be dropped by parachute from assault planes or unloaded from cargo planes and ships.

"Operation of the [truck] must be conducted with special attention and caution," said one Army warning to commanders this month that cited a series of "rollover accidents." While there have been an unspecified number of troop injuries, there have been no deaths, according to Army officials.

Involved are most of the first 8,000 of 85,488 trucks that are part of a \$15.7-billion Pentagon program to replace Army vehicles dating to the Korean war.

The disclosures come on the eve of a Clinton administration decision to sign a new contract with Stewart & Stevenson, the Houston defense contractor, to buy 9,000 more trucks identified as FMTVs (Family of Medium Tactical Vehicles).

"It is a class-one, serious problem, and we are very concerned about it," said Ken Jenkins, a spokesman for Stewart & Stevenson.

Jenkins said efforts were being made to identify and fix the problem. Still uncertain is whether taxpayers would have to pay to fix the defective trucks or if the cost would be picked up by Stewart & Stevenson.

The contractor assembles the trucks from parts supplied by others. The company had never built trucks before landing the first phase of the contract, a \$1.4-billion pact for 11,000 trucks, in 1991. So far, the Army has 8,000 of the trucks in the field, and another 3,000 are slated to be built this year.

Army officials, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said there was no reason to delay signing the new contract, which must be approved by Defense Secretary William Cohen.

These Army officials, who characterized the truck mishaps as "laydowns and not rollovers," said predicted repairs could be made quickly without forcing the truck production line to shut down.

Other Army officers have expressed concern over the performance of the trucks.

In addition to load and speed restrictions, more than 100 of the trucks with potential defects that could cause accidents have been ordered parked indefinitely in unit motor pools.

Possible design flaws involving the first order of trucks now fielded with Army combat divisions raise questions about

Army testing and new procurement policies implemented in 1991 by President Bill Clinton's defense chiefs.

The \$15-billion program envisions 14 variations of two basic design frames, a 2.5-ton and 5-ton truck.

Jenkins, who also oversees assembly of the trucks at the firm's plant, acknowledged in an interview this week a serious flaw with the 2.5-ton truck, known to soldiers as the "deuce-and-a-half." The Army has 4,200 of these 2.5-ton vehicles in the field.

According to Jenkins, some of the rollovers have been traced to a defective power train. He said the firm was on the verge of identifying the cause and proposing a fix for the defect.

"We're trying to get to the root cause and we're close," Jenkins said.

Essentially, Jenkins said the drive shaft has been known to fracture when the truck is traveling at high speed and the truck bed is empty. The drive shaft flails and has severed brake lines, an event that causes the truck brakes to automatically lock.

"These are catastrophic failures," Jenkins said.

According to Jenkins, the driveshaft was made by Meritor of Troy, Mich. Christine Zwick, a spokeswoman for Meritor, said she would have no immediate comment.

Newsday has learned there have been more than a dozen rollovers involving a variety of incidents, including the broken drive shafts at high speeds, driver error and tires being caught between roads and their

shoulders.

In at least two incidents at Ft. Campbell, Ky., Jenkins said, the broken drive shaft and locked brakes caused the 2.5-ton trucks to roll on their sides. One soldier was injured, with fractured ribs, Jenkins said.

Other bases where troops are operating the new truck include Ft. Huachuca, Ariz.; Ft. Drum, N.Y.; Ft. Polk, La.; Ft. Bragg, N.C.; and Forces Command, Atlanta, Ga. Army officials say they do not have a complete list of where the accidents have occurred.

Some Army officers have informally expressed concern about the truck's high center of gravity designed to keep its axles and undercarriage from snaring battlefield obstacles. The bed of the truck is 63 inches off the ground, and a ladder, stowed under the truck, is required for troops climbing aboard. The old version of the 2.5 had a tailgate with a foot stirrup.

Jenkins said the rollovers were unrelated to the truck's center of gravity. "We have more than 1 million miles of tests and the center of gravity tests pushed the envelope with heavy loads," Jenkins said.

However, one Army safety bulletin warned commanders to follow loading procedures that are not specified in the truck manual.

"It is recommended that cargo height be restricted at this time to no greater than the height of troops seats in the upright position," the Army warning said. "If loads greater than that are needed, drivers should reduce speed, avoid sharp turns and sudden movements, ensure cargo is thoroughly secured and travel on improved road -- if possi-

ble."

Other concerns raised by units operating the truck included a knob used to position the steering wheel. Bumpy roads have been known to loosen the control knob, resulting in the steering wheel suddenly falling away from the

driver.

"Operators with limited strength might want to ask their assistant driver to tighten the knob," said one Army bulletin.

Until it began producing the FMTV, Stewart & Stevenson assembled vehicles and machinery only for the Texas

oil industry. It won one of the largest Pentagon contracts after Clinton's acquisition officials concluded that basic equipment such as trucks could be built with off-the-shelf items without costly research and development.

Jenkins emphasized that

while Stewart & Stevenson was the prime contractor, it merely assembled parts from subcontractors. The diesel engine is built by Caterpillar Inc. in Peoria, Ill.; and the transmission by Allison Transmission, a subsidiary of General Motors Corp. in Indianapolis.

Playboy Model Faces Action

European Stars & Stripes May 4, 1998 Pg. 3

JACKSONVILLE, Fla. — A naval flight officer who posed in Playboy magazine under the line "fly girl" may face disciplinary action from the Navy.

Lt. Frederica Spilman, 28, is scheduled to leave the service Thursday, two days after the magazine hits newsstands. But

the Navy could keep her on active duty past that date if it decides to administer disciplinary procedures, said Pat Dooling, a spokesman at Jacksonville Naval Air Station.

She could face violations of Navy uniform regulations and conduct unbecoming. The pictorial in the June issue features

photos of Spilman covered with loosely opened flight jackets, camouflage lingerie and dog tags.

"The Navy's top brass might object to my posing, but many people will support my decision," Spilman told Playboy. Spilman navigated an electronic reconnaissance jet

and made two deployments to the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf, flying missions over Bosnia and Herzegovina and Iraq.

Her husband, Navy Lt. Nick Loghides, said he has no problem with his wife appearing nude in 3.4 million copies of Playboy.

WWII Remains Sought

European Stars & Stripes May 4, 1998 Pg. 3

STRASBOURG, France — American military officials are searching a forest in western France for the remains of a B-24 bomber that crashed during World War II, French police said Sunday.

The U.S. team, accompanied by French specialists, also is trying to find the remains of the nine-member crew of the Liberator plane, which went down Dec. 11, 1944.

The wreck was discovered only a year ago in the

Zinswiller forest in France's northern Vosges mountains, not far from the German border.

The investigators already have found about 500 hundred pieces of clothing, bones and teeth, French police said. The

American specialists have been sent from U.S. military bases in Germany to conduct the hunt, which has been going on for several days and is expected to continue through the week.

No other details were immediately available.

New York Times

May 4, 1998

Despite Antitrust Efforts, Microsoft Rules in Government Offices

By Steve Lohr

Even as it steps up its antitrust pursuit of Microsoft Corp., the government is becoming increasingly dependent on the company's software.

The U.S. Army, Navy, Social Security Administration, Health and Human Services Department, Defense Logistics Agency, Postal Service, Coast Guard and, yes, the Justice Department, Microsoft's antitrust antagonist, have all started programs to use Microsoft software on tens of thousands of desktop computers.

Part of the push toward Microsoft involves the company's office productivity and communications programs like its Word for word processing and its Excel spreadsheet, which in many federal offices are replacing software from Wordperfect and Lotus. But the biggest move involves sales of Microsoft's industrial-strength operating system, Windows NT, which is becoming more and

more popular in corporate America.

"Microsoft and especially Windows NT are just taking over the desktop in the federal government," said Robert Dornan, senior vice president of Federal Sources Inc., a research firm in McLean, Va. "And I don't see anything on the horizon that would undermine its success."

To be sure, the spectacle of Washington's beating Microsoft with one hand while buying from it with the other is not as glaringly contradictory as it might seem. The antitrust confrontation with Microsoft, the Justice Department insists, is not intended to hobble the company but to protect competition and innovation in the software industry.

The focus of the investigation, as the department considers filing a major antitrust case against Microsoft, is on accusations that the company is using its near-monopoly in the market for personal computer

operating-system software to gain an unfair advantage in the new markets of Internet software, new media and online commerce.

But if Microsoft succeeds not through unfair advantages but by offering the best product for the best price, then modern antitrust policy is working as it should. "That's right," a senior Justice Department official said on condition that he not be identified by name, because "I certainly don't want to throw them a bouquet."

Feeling embattled these days, Microsoft is uncharacteristically touchy about the success of its government business. An executive in its Washington office observed, "Now remember, we lose sales, too" -- not exactly the take-no-prisoners ethos long espoused by William H. Gates, Microsoft's chairman, or Steven Ballmer, the executive vice president in charge of sales.

Microsoft started its government business in 1986 with

a one-person office in Washington. Today, the company has 120 people in its federal systems unit, about 20 more than a year ago. Given the Justice Department's antitrust investigation, and all the resulting public attention, the Microsoft staff refers jokingly to the Washington office as "ground zero."

Still, the Washington business is thriving. The company does not disclose its government sales. But industry analysts estimate that in the current fiscal year, ending in June, its government sales will be about \$380 million, up nearly 40 percent from the previous year.

The far higher sales will probably come over the next several years as large installations of Microsoft software gain momentum -- especially for Windows NT, which is typically used for big networks of PC work stations.

The Social Security Administration, for example, began a program last year to in-

stall 70,000 Windows NT work stations, running off 5,000 Windows NT network server computers, by 2003.

And the U.S. Postal Service is replacing its 80,000 point-of-sale terminals nationwide with Windows NT work stations.

"These government customers are very big, so when they make a decision, the rollouts can be huge," said Pete Hayes, general manager of Microsoft's federal systems business.

To the government, the appeal of Microsoft products is

the potential cost saving and the ease of using its industry-standard programs. In many cases, Windows NT systems are replacing systems that use the Unix operating system, initially developed for scientific and research purposes. With the steady improvement in PC performance, personal computers can match the performance of Unix work stations at perhaps half the price or less, by some estimates.

Once a technology laggard,

the government "is leading the charge on NT in some ways, pushing it into more advanced uses that you see in most corporations," said Mathew Mahoney, an analyst for IDC Government, a research service in Falls Church, Va.

The Air Force is an example of that. In a pilot program, it is beginning to experiment with moving some of its vital command-and-control operations -- which range from mapping battlefields to spotting enemy

fighter jets -- away from bigger, more costly computers onto personal computers running Windows NT.

"People in the industry say that Windows NT can take over these applications at far less cost," said Col. Richard Picanso, director of the command-and-control computer systems at Hanscom Air Force Base in Bedford, Mass. "We want to see how much of that is marketing hype and how much of that is real."

Downside of the NATO expansion

PAT BUCHANAN

A century ago, William McKinley, a teen-age veteran of Antietam who had wanted his presidency remembered as a time of prosperity and peace, took America to war with Spain. It lasted four months, ending in total triumph for the United States, which lost more men to fever in Florida than to gunfire in Cuba.

Flush with victory in the "splendid little war," McKinley made the most fateful foreign policy decision of the century. Against the protests of poets, scholars and statesmen from Grover Cleveland to William Jennings Bryan, McKinley annexed the Philippines. America assumed the rule of an alien people it had no intention of allowing to become U.S. citizens. America had become an empire.

With annexation came a deepening U.S. involvement in the imperial conflicts of Asia, which led to Pearl Harbor and ultimately U.S. involvement in wars in Korea and Vietnam.

In the triumphal hubris of 1898, Americans forgot the warnings of George Washington about empires and foreign entanglements. And we have forgotten them today.

Reveling in our Cold War victory, the Senate is joining Bill Clinton in handing out permanent security guarantees to Eastern Europe, where no president has ever seen a vital interest and no U.S. army -- not even Gen. Eisenhower's -- ever fought before.

Consider who is leading us into this open-ended commitment to go to war, the instant Poland's borders are breached. Is it not ironic that NATO's expansion, so provocative to Russia, is being carried out by

Washington Times
May 4, 1998 Pg. 15

Democrats who used to charge President Reagan with being provocative because of his "Evil Empire" rhetoric and Strategic Defense Initiative?

NATO expansionists argue that by bringing in Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, we consolidate the gains of our Cold War victory. Do they not realize that it was not NATO that drove the Red Army out of Europe? That army was ordered out by Moscow on an understanding, given by a U.S. secretary of state, that NATO would not be moved east to the border of Mother Russia.

Today, we are in violation of that understanding and dishonoring our word. If a second Cold War comes, and it appears on the way, the responsibility will rest as much with Washington as with Moscow.

What about the former captive nations, we are asked. Do you want to leave them to Moscow's mercy? The answer is no. But the way to keep these nations free is not through an absurd threat of nuclear war but by making Russia a partner and ally, and by giving Moscow a diplomatic, political and economic stake in its Western connections too rich to risk by recreating an empire Russia gave up.

By extending war guarantees to Eastern Europe, America gains nothing in the way of security yet adds enormously to its risks and obligations.

With NATO expansion, we give up forever our freedom to decide when and whether to go to war. We give up forever the opportunity to bring the boys home, and we lock ourselves forever into virtually every future

European war. NATO expansion entails a contemptuous dismissal of the wisdom of America's greatest men, who warned us again and again against permanent alliances.

That One Worlders are doing this is easy to understand; that self-professed conservatives are collaborating seems inexplicable -- further proof that there is no true conservative party in Washington today.

Feeling deceived and humiliated, Moscow is now opposing U.S. policy almost everywhere -- lining up with Serbia in Kosovo, taking Saddam's side on sanctions, selling anti-aircraft missiles to Cyprus to deepen the Greek-Turkish rift, bullying Latvia, shipping nuclear technology and missile components to Iran, and forming a strategic partnership with China.

Meanwhile, our European allies show little willingness to pay for NATO's expansion and no enthusiasm for Mr. Clinton's desire to bring in the Baltic republics. Indeed, does anyone seriously think that France, which lined up with Moscow in the Gulf crisis, would join us in a war on Russia over Poland? Would Germany, which warned Ronald Reagan it would not even put Warsaw in default over the crushing of Solidarity, declare war on a nation with 10,000 nuclear weapons over a crisis with Poland?

NATO expansion will thus one day come to mean a unilateral U.S. war guarantee to Eastern Europe. And every lesson of history tells us that this is hubristic folly.

NATO expansion takes away from future generations the right to decide themselves when and where to go to war, and ensures the enmity of a revived and nationalistic Russia. And how does that make America more secure?

Pat Buchanan is a nationally syndicated columnist.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee
EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson
SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe ADMINISTRATION: Wendy Powers PRODUCTION: Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)